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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the knowledge and desires of parents of middle school students with ID regarding inclusive education practices and laws in South Korea. I interviewed seven mothers of children with ID who attended South Korean middle school. Three themes emerged including (a) mother-teacher communication, (b) particular knowledge that suppressed further desires for inclusive education, and (c) culture-based advocacy for inclusive education. I discussed these findings based on Confucianism, collectivism, social and medical models of disability, and Rawls’s theory of justice. The mothers neither knew about inclusive education laws nor valued the laws. Instead, they used Confucian advocacy strategies for their children’s legal rights. Their desired laws were relevant to quality of teachers and disability awareness of typically developing children. The mothers’ Confucian approach to disability, education, and morality seemed to make them settle for mere physical integration and antidiscrimination of their children with ID, and did not support their desires for inclusive education practices necessary for the children’s functional and academic development and belonging to peer groups without having pull-out special education. Their desired practice was a teacher-led partnership. These findings might indicate the need for a
paradigm shift for these mothers to advocate for what they desired beyond what is currently available for the children’s inclusive education.
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Chapter I. Introduction

Inclusive education has been justified based on social justice and social models (Winzer, 2014). The United Nations (U.N.; 2006) stated the importance of inclusive education as protecting the right to education “without discrimination and on the basis of equal opportunity” (U.N., 2006, p. 16). The right to education requires equal access to education with the supports necessary to produce benefits from it (U.N., 2006), not merely provision of equal education in the same settings. When viewing a disability as the result of interactions between people and a society that prevents them from “their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others” (U.N., 2006, p. 1), a society should make effort to improve its capacity to enable those with disabilities to take a full and critical part in it. Consistent with this, the U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO; 2017) defined inclusive education as a “process of strengthening the capacity of the education system to reach out to all learners” (p. 7).

This perspective is also the basis of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA; 2004). The IDEA specified that (b) a disability is not a personal deficit but “a natural part of the human experience,” and (b) the national policy should prevent it from restricting individuals’ participation in or contribution to the society (20 U.S.C.§1400(c)(1)). Building upon this, although the IDEA did not use the term inclusive education, the IDEA established systematic legal protections for inclusive education such as the principle of free appropriate public education (FAPE) and the least restrictive environment (LRE) as well as the individualized education program (IEP), and procedural safeguards.
American society provided separate education based on race (i.e., white and African American students) by the middle of 20th century. Many students with disabilities, however, were excluded from public education because of their disabilities (20 U.S.C.§1400(c)(2)(B); Zettel & Ballard, 1979). The US Supreme Court, however, ruled in the case of Brown v. Board of Education (1954) that separate education based on race was not equal, and thus violated the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

For children with disabilities, parental advocacy played a crucial role in advancing the equal right to education (Gartner & Lipsky, 1987; Keogh, 2007; Wright & Wright, 2007; Yell, Rogers, & Rogers, 1998). In the 1970s, many parents of children with ID gained knowledge of dehumanizing conditions in institutions via media and/or experience (Braddock & Parish, 2001; Roach, 1978). With that knowledge and encouraged by the Brown case ruling, parents brought their cases to the courts to protect the equal right to education for their children with ID (Roach, 1978; Wright & Wright, 2007; Yell, Rogers, & Rogers, 1998) such as Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children (PARC) v. the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (1971) and Mills v. Board of Education (1972). The courts’ decisions were consistent with the case of Brown v. Board of Education (1954) and became the legal foundation that allowed children with ID to attend a public school without being separated from peers due to ID. Furthermore, parents of children with ID advocated for enacting the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975; current IDEA) that initially legislated the principles of FAPE, LRE, procedural due process, and the requirement of an IEP (Gartner & Lipsky, 1987; Keogh, 2007, Trainer, 2010).
Similar to the US, South Korea started special education in separate settings from general education (e.g., special classes, special schools). The Korean special education law was first established in 1977 based on the advocacy of professionals, special education teachers, and administrators for protecting the right to education for children with disabilities (B. H. Kim, 2005). Although this law contributed to increasing the number of special education places and ensuring the quality of special education teachers, the separateness of the education was not challenged until the special education law was amended in 1994 (B. H. Kim, 2005; Jung, 2017; J. Ryu, 2013). The amendment to the special education law (1994) included (a) the term *inclusive education* defined as educating students with disabilities in a general education school or having special school students participate in the general education curriculum for a short period (e.g., a few hours) in order to support social development, and (b) the new definition of special classes (i.e., classes for supporting inclusive education; Jung, 2017). Hong (2006) stated that this legislation on inclusive education was influenced by American special education. Parents of children with disabilities in South Korea learned about the inclusive education provision after the passage of the new statutes and relevant educational policies, while those in the US had been actively involved in advocating for inclusive education fighting against separate education and instrumental in passing legislation.

The prior Korean special education law was replaced in 2007 after one more amendment in 1997. A national advocacy association that included parents of children with disabilities had submitted a motion to establish a new special education law in 2004 (Won-kyung Kim & Han, 2007). Its main aims were (a) to extend the period of compulsory education for children with disabilities from elementary and middle schools
to preschool, elementary, middle, and high schools, and (b) to ensure free early education for three or younger children with disabilities (J. Ryu, 2012). This new Korean special education law was titled the Act on Special Education for Persons with Disabilities (ASED; Act 13978).

Most of the previous law on inclusive education remained the same in the ASED (2007), but the act contained a new definition of inclusive education. According to the ASED Article 2-6, inclusive education refers to appropriate education to meet educational needs of students with disabilities that they receive in a general education school with peers without discrimination on the basis of categories and severity of their disabilities. Compared to the former definition, the 2007 law expanded the goal of inclusive education from improving only social development to meeting individual students’ educational needs (Ui-jung Kim, Kim, Choi, & Kwon, 2011). The new definition, however, did not include special school students’ participation in the general curriculum. Even so, several Korean researchers contended that this new definition presented a more clear direction of inclusive education and strengthened schools’ accountability for inclusive education (Bae, 2013; Jung, 2017; Ui-jung Kim et al., 2011).

**Problem Statement**

Although the government has established legal protection for inclusive education since the 1990s, many children with disabilities, particularly children with intellectual disability (ID), continue to receive separate education in South Korea. The UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2014) reported that (a) many children with disabilities have transferred from general schools to special schools, and (b) even the students with disabilities attending general education schools have not received
appropriate education for their educational needs in South Korea. The annual report of the South Korean Ministry of Education (2017) indicated that 70.7% of students with disabilities attended general education schools (e.g., full-time general education classes, part-time special classes) and only 28.9% of them were educated in special schools. Although fewer students attended special schools, most of the special schools (69.9%; n = 121) were specialized for educating students with ID. This suggests that many students with ID still receive separate education.

Children with disabilities are legally allowed to attend a general education school if they want (ASED Article 4, 2017; Elementary and Secondary Education Act Article 54, 2016). Many parents of children with ID, however, seem to prefer special schools for their children considering (a) many students with ID have attended special schools despite this legal protection, and (b) the number of special schools for children with ID has increased (Ministry of Education, 2017). An incident relevant to this issue occurred on September 5, 2017. A group of parents who had children with ID kneeled down before residents who opposed constructing a new special school in their village (Jihoon Lee, Kim, & Kim, 2017). These parents highlighted the need to build a new special school in the village because their children have had a hard time in attending a current special school due to the long distance from their home (e.g., going to school too early morning, spending over one hour in a school shuttle bus). The residents opposed the construction because they concerned that their house prices could be dropped after a special school is built in their village.

When this incident was reported, South Korean public opinion was to be blamed the village residents for Not In My Back Yard (NIMBY) syndrome. Many people
advocated for the parents, maintaining that building special schools is necessary to protect the right to education of children with ID. Little attention was given to the question of why the parents begged for a new special school instead of sending their children to the general education school closer to their home.

The five-year plan for South Korean special education (South Korean Ministry of Education, 2017) seems to reflect this incident and the resulting public opinion in that the plan included building at least 22 new special schools within five years. If this plan is successfully fulfilled, there will be a minimum of 196 special schools in 2022 in South Korea (land size: 38,691 mi²; population: 51.25 million people; World Bank, 2016). Either parents’ preferences or increasing availability of special schools would be obstacles to inclusive education because a separate educational system prevents students with ID from getting access to the general curriculum (Jackson, Ryndak, & Wehmeyer, 2010).

Some researchers in South Korea have examined parents’ difficulties with inclusive education for children with ID. Participating parents described (a) social isolation of children with ID (M. Choi & Jeung, 2014; W. Lee & Kwak, 2014; Young-nam Park & Chu, 2010); (b) general education teachers’ negative or indifferent attitude (S. Han & Lee, 2011; W. Lee & Kwak, 2014); (c) academic curriculum that did not meet educational needs of children with ID (W. Lee & Kwak, 2014); and (d) a lack of collaboration between special and general education teachers (M. Choi & Jeung, 2014; W. Lee & Kwak, 2014). When the researchers asked parents about desired supports to achieve inclusive education, the parents stated general solutions to these difficulties such as improving (a) teachers’ knowledge and skills, (b) teachers’ and peers’ understandings
of disabilities, and (c) collaboration between special and general education teachers.

These “solutions” seem to be merely positive statements of the parents’ negative experiences. For example, parents desired supports for collaboration between special and general education teachers because they experienced a lack of collaboration.

This might be because their reference was limited to their experience only. In the study by Grove and Fisher (1999), parents stated that they started to advocate for inclusive education after they gained information on it via parent conferences, newsletters, and so on. Given this, provision of sufficient information on inclusive education supports and connections with other parents, professionals, and advocates could help parents envision and advocate for the education that they truly desire for their children with ID rather than choose what is currently available (i.e., special school).

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the knowledge and desires of parents of middle school students with ID regarding inclusive education laws and practices in South Korea. I define inclusive education as education that students with disabilities receive participating in the curricular, extracurricular, and other activities with typically developing peers in a general education school. In this research, inclusive education practices refer to interventions that help students with ID engage in academic and/or social activities with typically developing peers in a general education school. Specifically, my research questions include:

(a) What do parents know about legal protection for inclusive education of students with ID?
(b) What laws do parents want to have for inclusive education of students with ID?

(c) What do parents know about inclusive education practices for middle school students with ID?

(d) What inclusive education practices do parents want to be implemented for students with ID?

**Chapter II. Conceptual Framework**

The context of this research is South Korea where inclusive education was introduced to parents of children with ID through the national policies (Yong-Wook Kim, 2013, 2014). This is different from the beginning of inclusive education in the US where parental advocacy was one of the great factors of establishing legal protection from separate education. I used multiple theories for this research including Rawls’s theory of justice, social and medical models of disability, Confucianism, collectivism, and individualism. Literature reviews for this research involved reviews of qualitative research that explored parents’ experiences and support needs for their children’s inclusive education and reviews of experimental studies focused on effective inclusive education practices for adolescents with ID.

**Special Education in South Korea**

Special education policies in South Korea has focused on quantity and quality of separate education. Parents of children with disabilities did not challenge separateness of special education but were given inclusive education by the national policies. The Education Acts (1981) provided an initial legal basis of physical integration by allowing installation of special education classrooms in elementary and middle schools (Yong-
Specific laws for inclusive education were first stipulated in 1994 when the Special Education Promotion Law (1977) was amended.

**Origin of special education.** Special education in South Korea started in the early 1900s. A few missionaries from the United States and the United Kingdom (e.g., Rosetta Sherwood Hall, Pash, Perry) taught people with visual and/or hearing impairments in the form of a special class in this period (Young-Kyoon Park, 2005). Young-Kyoon Park noted that its curriculum initially consisted of “Bible, geography, music, calculation, knitting, and physical message classes” in addition to lessons for using braille (p. 17). Although special education was delivered within a general education school, this seems more likely to be separate education rather than inclusive education because students with disabilities learned in a different classroom from typically developing peers. This, however, would not mean that the pioneers of Korean special education separated people with disabilities from a community. Rather, they aimed at giving educational opportunities to individuals with disabilities because the majority of them had not received school education.

Education for people with visual and hearing impairment continued during the Japanese colonial period (1910-1945). The Japanese government made a school for individuals with visual and hearing impairment (i.e., Je Sang Won, now Seoul National School for the Blind and Seoul National School for the Deaf) in 1913 (B. H. Kim, 2008a). According to the Academy of Korean Studies (1995), two Japanese teachers and a Korean teacher (Doo-seong Park) taught Japanese, math, music, physical education for students with visual and hearing impairments, acupuncture and braille for those with visual impairment, and sign languages for those with hearing impairment. The school
initially had 27 students with visual or hearing impairment (Academy of Korean Studies, 1995). Park studied Louis Braille to teach Korean to students with visual impairment and released Korean braille in 1923 under the Japanese government’s approval (B. H. Kim, 2008a).

As Korea became liberated from the Japanese colonial rule in 1945, Pastor Young-sik Lee played an important role in cultivating the special education system in Korea (B. H. Kim, 2008a). B. H. Kim described details about Pastor Lee’s work as follows. He established a private school for people with visual and hearing impairment (now Daegu Younghwa School) in 1946. Three years later, he went to the National Assembly with the school students to show legislators that those with visual and hearing impairments can learn. The students showed reading braille, using an abacus, singing the Korean national anthem using sign language to legislators. Then, Pastor Lee made a speech about the importance of national support for special education. The legislators promised a provision of the support at that time, but the Korean War occurred in 1950 before the promise came true.

Before the Korean War, Korea had laws governing special education as a part of the Law of Education (1949) (C. Park, 2010, p. 135). Based on the equal right to education in the Korean constitution (1948), the Law of Education included two special education laws (B. H. Kim, 1994). As noted by Kim, one was each state’s duty of establishing one special school. The other was that elementary and middle schools could install special classes for children with disabilities. Kim contended that many children with disabilities were actually excluded because of another law that schools could delay the admission of children who had physical and/or mental health problems.
Pastor Lee continued to cultivate the special education field in South Korea with his two sons after the division of Korea into two parts, North and South Korea, in 1952 (B. H. Kim, 2008a). Kim noted that pastor Lee rebuilt the school for children with visual and hearing impairment in 1954 and extended its educational system from an elementary school level to middle and high school levels in 1955. In addition, he served as the first president of the Korean Association for Special Education in 1961. His son, Tae-young Lee established the first special school for children with ID (now Daegu Bomyung School) in 1966 (B. H. Kim, 2008a).

B. H. Kim (2008a) contended that Korean special education was influenced by Japan until the middle of the 1970s and by the U.S. from the late 1970s for the following reasons. When the first college of special education opened, its courses included education for children with visual and hearing impairment, ID, and physical disabilities. The college courses for education for children with ID and physical education, however, were delivered in a manner of an intensive special lecture by Japanese professors because there was no professor teaching these courses in Korea at that time (B. H. Kim, 2008b). In 1971, two universities (i.e., Ewha Women’s University and Dankook University) opened special education departments and hired many professors who studied special education in America.

**Special education law.** The first special education law was enacted in 1977 as a result of two conferences held by the Korean Association for Special Education (Yong-Kyoon Kim, 2005). As noted by Yong-Kyoon Kim, the Association held the first conference in 1973 to discuss how to increase and effectively operate special classes. Kim stated that there were already 38 special classes in two states at that time. In January
1977, the association held a second conference for administrators (i.e., school presidents, supervisors in school districts) and special class teachers (B. H. Kim, 2005). Kim noted that the attendant teachers created nine recommendations for future special education in a final plenary session of the conference. One of them was to establish the Special Education Promotion Law to protect the right to education for all children with disabilities and to improve quality of special education.

The first South Korean special education law, the Special Education Promotion Law, was eventually passed in December 1977 and became in effect from 1979. This law included (a) increasing the number of special schools and special classes, (b) providing free education for children with disabilities, and (c) improving qualification of special education teachers. This law was revised and reauthorized in 1994 and abolished after the enactment of the Act on Special Education for Persons with Disabilities (2008). The amendment in 1994 first included the term inclusive education in the special education law.

The current special education law is the Act on Special Education for Persons with Disabilities authorized in 2008 (ASED; Act 13978). Parental organizations spoke up for their children with disabilities in collaboration with a political organization throughout the process of enactment of the ASED, and many of their requests were accepted in this new legislation (Won-kung Kim & Han, 2007). The term promotion was taken out from the title of this law because the meaning of promotion in Korean includes acts of benevolence but education for children with disabilities is a right, not a benefit from benevolence (J. Ryu, 2012; H. Han & Kim, 2008). Although the ASED abandoned benevolence-based special education and reflected requests of parents of children with
disabilities, it is still based on the medical perspective on disability considering disability as the individual’s deficits and special education as complementary education for fixing the personal deficits.

The purpose of South Korean special education law changed from contribution to stabilizing the lives of persons with special education needs and improving their participation in society to their self-realization and social inclusion (Chapter 1 Article 1). For this new purpose, the ASED stated that federal and local governments should provide integrated environments and education suitable for their life cycle, disability type, and the severity of their disability. Given this, special education stated in this purpose statement might not necessarily support access to the general curriculum for students with disabilities. It is an individualized education based on their chronological ages and characteristics of disabilities. This is consistent with the legal definition of special education stating that special education is a curriculum suitable for educational needs of the student with a disability and related services (Chapter 1 Article 2-1). Although the ASED changed the term therapy education into therapy supports, the focus on the disability type and severity still represents a medical perspective on disability.

It appears that the legal definition of inclusive education in the ASED is still based on the medical model of disability. It states that students with disabilities should not be discriminated on the basis of their disability types and severity and receive education suitable for educational needs of each of the students together with typically developing peers (Chapter 1 Article 2-6). “Education suitable for individual educational needs” would be individualized education based on disability type and severity as stated in the definition of special education. It would be ironic that education based on disability
types and severity is delivered differently from the general curriculum in a general education classroom without being discriminated based on their disability type and severity. This is because restriction of access to the general curriculum in general class is discrimination. Despite this fact, the ASED has no law for access to the general curriculum.

The Chapter 1 Article 20 stipulated that principals of special education institutions (e.g., the principle of a special school, principle of a general education school where a special education class is installed) can modify a curriculum on a basis of disability types and severity of students with disabilities. Also, Chapter 1 Article 21-2 states that principals of inclusive schools should establish and implement an inclusive education plan including curriculum modification, a provision of assistants and assistive devices for learning, and teacher training. The modification stated in these statutes, however, do not have to be aligned with the general curriculum. The ASED regulation Article 3-2-4 allowed to use a basic curriculum for students with disabilities who have difficulty in following the general curriculum. I provided details about this issue under the subtitle curriculum.

**Current special education structure.** South Korean educational system consists of preschool, six-year elementary school, three-year middle school, three-year high school, and postsecondary education (Act 14150, Article 9, 2016). The majority of special school has all of these school levels including preschool, elementary, middle, high schools, and post-secondary vocational courses on the law that schools can incorporate those school levels (Act 13943, Article 30, 2016). Based on the age range for compulsory education (i.e., three to 19-year-old) and the Article 30 of the Elementary and Secondary
Education Act (2016), special schools have preschool to high school courses, and the majority of them have two-year postsecondary vocational training courses.

All schools including special schools use a school year system in which students advance to the next year course (i.e., grade level rises) in every March if they attended a school for the required number of days (Presidential Decree 26551, Article 50, 2015). Students with and without disabilities are managed by a homeroom teacher who is primarily in charge of checking attendance, making announcements, and dealing with overall issues on the students’ school lives. Homeroom teachers get paid for this work (nearly $100 a month).

Placement in a general education school is divided into full-time special class (education in a self-contained classroom), part-time special class (pull-out special education), and full inclusion (ASED Chapter 1 Article 17). Students with disabilities in full-time special class have a special education teacher as their homeroom teacher, and most of their classes are in a special education classroom. Students with disabilities who are placed in part-time special class have both a special education teacher and a general education teacher as their homeroom teachers. Students with disabilities in full inclusion have no class in a special education classroom, and their homeroom teacher is a general education teacher who manages the inclusive homeroom these students belong to. A special education teacher is not these students’ homeroom teacher in every case although a special education teacher addresses administrative and assistive work for these students.

According to the annual reports of special education (MOE, 2016), South Korean special education institutions consisted of (a) special schools ($n = 170$; 4,550 classes included), (b) special classes ($n = 10,065$), (c) general education classes ($n = 14,482$), and
Special Education Support Centers ($n = 60$) in 2016. These data did not include hospital schools (i.e., special education institution within a hospital for students with health impairments) and itinerant education services. This is because the majority of hospital schools were subordinate institutions of special schools, and itinerant education services were provided by teachers in special schools, special classes, or the Special Education Support Centers. Based on the MOE data, there were 33 special education institutions within general or mental hospitals.

Students with disabilities ($n = 87,950$) were served in (a) special schools (29%), (b) special classes (53%), (c) general education classes (17.4%), or (d) Special Education Support Centers (0.6%). Although special classes can provide full-time or part-time educational services depending on individual students’ needs, the MOE did not specify the hours that students with disabilities received education in special classes. In other words, the MOE did not include data on the number of hours that students with disabilities attended general education classes.

UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2014) pointed out that many of children with disabilities included in general education schools have moved to more segregated settings (e.g., self-contained classrooms, special schools). This committee also noted that even the students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms have not taken appropriate education for their educational needs. The committee’s reports appear to reveal the gap between the legal protection and actual inclusive education practices and to raise some questions about other variables threatening inclusive education. This also indicates that South Korea needs to improve quality of inclusive education rather than increasing the number of special classes.
Curriculum. South Korea have national curriculums from preschool to high schools. According to the ASED (2016), curriculums are determined by the ASED regulation (2008) for children with disabilities at the age three to 19 (i.e., the age range of compulsory education) and by school principals for those under three-year-old or over 19 (i.e., early intervention and post-secondary vocational courses in special schools). The ASED regulation (2008) specified the compulsory special education curriculums including (a) the general curriculum that the Minister of Education determined (i.e., preschool education curriculum, elementary and secondary education curriculum) and (b) the Special Education Basic Curriculum for children with disabilities who have difficulty with learning the general curriculum. Principals of special education institutions can flexibly use these curriculums based on individual students’ educational needs and disability categories and severity (Act 13978, Article 20, 2016).

Regarding the general curriculum, the Presidential Decree Article 42 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (2015) stipulates class subjects required to teach across elementary to high school levels and special schools. The common class subjects include language arts, moral education, social studies, math, science, practical arts, physical education, music, fine arts, foreign languages and other elective classes that the Minister of Education determined. These curriculums are determined by the Minister of Education, and a superintendent of education in each province can adjust them (Act 13943, Article 23, 2016). In addition, schools should use textbooks with the South Korean government’s copyright or those that the MOE authorized or admitted (Act 13943, Article 29, 2016).
Special education institutions can use the Special Education Basic Curriculum for students with disabilities who have difficulty with the general education curriculum. This curriculum was recently revised in 2015. According to the Special Education Basic Curriculum (2015), the elementary school courses consist of language arts, social studies, math, science/practical arts, physical education, and music/fine arts. The middle and high school courses include language arts, social studies, math, science, career and occupation, physical education, music/fine arts, and elective subjects (i.e., rehabilitation, the use of leisure time, the use of information and communication technology, daily English, health). South Korean MOE has published textbooks that involved three levels of each class subject in the Basic Curriculum (Act 13943, Article 29, 2016). Thus, when using the textbooks, students with disabilities are supposed to learn these three levels of those class subjects from elementary to high schools for 12 years (K. Kang et al., 2015). Some researchers, however, reported special education teachers’ low utilization rate of those textbooks (Baek, 2016; D. Lee, 2014; D. Chung, Kim, & Kim, 2016; Jinju Lee & Hong, 2011).

Proportion of disability categories in 2016. More than half of students receiving special education had ID (n = 47,258; 53.7%) according to the MOE annual reports (2016). This proportion was far greater than other disability categories: orthopedic impairments (12.5%), autism spectrum disorders (12.5%), developmental delay (5.6%), hearing impairments (3.9%), learning disabilities (2.7%), speech or language impairments (2.4%), visual impairments (2.3%), and health impairments (1.9%). Furthermore, the majority of special schools (n = 119; 70% of total special schools) focused on students with ID.
Special educational personnel. The MOE (2016) reported that special education teachers \((n = 18,772)\) worked in special schools \((42.9\%)\), special classes \((55.2\%)\), and the Special Education Support Centers \((1.9\%)\) across the country. Teachers working in special classes also provide support for students with disabilities placed in full-time general education classrooms, but the teachers are administratively assigned in special education classrooms. In addition, paraprofessionals \((n = 11,481)\) worked for students with disabilities placed in special schools \((33.1\%)\), special classes \((62.6\%)\), and full-time general education classrooms \((4.3\%)\).

Outcomes of students with disabilities after graduation. Based on the MOE data (2016), students with disabilities who graduated from high schools or special schools in 2015 \((n = 9,482)\) gained (a) higher education including vocational training \((36.6\%)\), (b) jobs \((17.9\%)\), or (c) none of them \((45.5\%)\). As seen these data, many of the graduates did not move forward to higher education nor get employed across the different educational placements. Compared to graduates from special schools, students with disabilities graduated from general education high schools were more likely to register higher education. I described the outcomes of different education placement for students with disabilities based on the MOE data as follows.

Students with disabilities who graduated from high school levels of special schools \((n = 2,460)\) moved to post-secondary education institutions \((55\%)\) or gained a job \((6.3\%)\). The rest of the students \((38.7\%)\) did not attend postsecondary courses nor get a job. The post-secondary courses that 55% of the students take included vocational training courses installed within a special school where they graduated. Graduates from post-secondary vocational training courses of special schools \((n = 1,960)\) registered
higher education (e.g., 1.4%) or got employed (33.9%). The majority of the graduates (64.7%), however, did not gain both a job and higher education.

Graduates who had full inclusion in general education high schools \((n = 1,354)\) registered higher education (51%) or gained a job (9.2%). The remaining students (39.9%) did not have higher education nor a job. Graduates placed in special classes in high schools \((n = 3,629)\) registered higher education (38.6%) or gained a job (19.2%). The remaining students (42.2%) did not gain both of them.

**Theoretical Framework**

My theoretical framework for this research is two-fold. First, my primary research lens was the social and medical models of disability and Rawls’s theory of justice. Second, I understood data considering the South Korean culture that entails Confucianism, traditional collectivism, and changes into individualism.

**Social vs. medical model of disability.** Inclusive education is justified based on a social model of disability (Winzer, 2014). This model defines impairments as “value-neutral bodily conditions” and disability as the person’s uncomfortable experiences caused by a society’s failure to accommodate the impairments (Manago, Davis, & Goar, 2017, p. 170). This indicates that disability is not an individual’s personal problem but relevant to his or her society’s responsibility for accommodating the society to the person’s impairment(s). The social model of disability seems consistent with Rawls’s theory of justice in that it presumes equal rights of people with impairments and views the provision of accommodation for these people to enjoy the rights as the society’s responsibility.
Haegele and Hodge (2016) stated that “isolation and exclusion can be a product of society’s inability, unwillingness, or neglect to remove environmental barriers encountered by those with disabilities or the perceptions of individuals with impairments as being less able to participate with members of society” (p. 197). From this perspective, it is difficult to justify separate education for students with disabilities in a special education classroom as preventing academic loss in general education classes. The separate special education in a general education school might rather represent the school’s “inability, unwillingness, or neglect” to support students with disabilities to gain academic achievement in inclusive classes.

The medical model of disability views a disability as “a deficit from the norm” (Manago et al., 2017, p. 170) and “abnormality” (Haegele & Hodge, 2016, p. 194). In other words, disability is the person’s private issue discrepant from the majority of a society’s members. From this perspective, the society is not responsible for the person’s disability although it could provide benevolence and charity for the person (Riddell, 2014). From this perspective, education for a person with a disability focuses on alleviating the person’s deficits. Roush and Sharby (2011) used the expression “fixing” deficits to explain services based on this model (p. 1718). The medical perspective on disability is often an initial approach to special education across the world (Riddell, 2014) and a rationale for institutionalization (Turnbull & Stowe, 2007).

**Rawls’s theory of justice.** Justice is a distributive principle for social systems (Rawls, 1971/1999). How justice is defined in a society determines how the society allocates “rights and duties and opportunities and privileges” to its members (Rawls, 1999, p.23). Rawls developed the theory of justice in opposition to utilitarianism that
defines justice based on the interests of a greater number of people, so-called “maximum happiness” (Sidgwick, 2000, p. 256). Rawls disagreed with the opinion that a society should sacrifice some members’ interests to satisfy a majority of its members. He claimed that each member in a society has the inviolability that nobody can invade even for all other persons’ welfare. From this perspective, he defined justice as fairness. Rawls formulated two principles of justice as fairness based on two roles of a social system. One is to protect individuals’ liberty, and the other is to resolve inequalities.

**Equal right to liberty.** The first principle is the equal right to liberty. Rawls (1999) stated, “each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive scheme of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar scheme of liberties for others” (p. 53). He arrayed examples of liberty such as “political liberty, freedom of thought, and freedom of the person, which includes freedom from psychological oppression and physical assault and dismemberment” (p. 53).

The South Korean laws for inclusive education in the ASED (2017) and Elementary and Secondary Education Act (2016) guarantee the right to liberty of children with disabilities to attend general education schools where all other children do. These laws indicate that a student with a disability can choose whether to receive inclusive education or to go to a special school. These laws consistently indicate that inclusive education is a choice of the student with a disability and his or her parents. Article 54 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act stipulated that national and local governments should develop a policy necessary for inclusive education when a student with a disability wants to attend a general education school. Although this law ensures an appropriate school policy for inclusive education, on the other hand it implies that
inclusive education is determined depending on the desires of a student with a disability. Furthermore, Article 4 in the ASED (2017) states that a general education school principal must not refuse a student with a disability to attend the school when the student wants to do.

Based on Rawls’s definition of liberty, the liberty of a student with disabilities to go to a general education school might be restricted under social pressure against inclusive education because it is up to a choice of the student with a disability. A recent incident reported in Korean newspaper articles (D. G. Kim, 2016; B. Kang, 2016) presented one example of the social pressure. A high school in South Korea expelled a student with ID for the reason that he frequently interrupted the other students’ learning (D. G. Kim, 2016; B. Kang, 2016). The student with ID emitted some problem behaviors in class such as yelling, banging a desk, and spitting (B. Kang, 2016). Parents of his peers expressed concerns about their children’s learning and requested the school to expel him (D. G. Kim, 2016; B. Kang, 2016). The school complied with this request even though the school administrators knew that the expulsion was illegal (B. Kang, 2016). The relevant laws are Article 3 and Article 4 in the ASED (2016) and the Act on the Prohibition of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities (2012). This school, however, avoided legal punishment by technically expelling the student before the results of the student’s eligibility for special education were announced (B. Kang, 2016).

The majority of the online reader comments on this incident showed negative perspectives of or experiences with inclusive education. I reviewed 28 reader comments connected to D. G. Kim’s (2016) newspaper article, excluding six comments that were related to general complaints about the Korean government. Twenty-one of the reviewed
comments (75%) were against inclusive education, and only seven comments (25%) showed disagreement with the school’s expulsion. The commenters opposed to inclusive education stated that students with ID might (a) not academically benefit from inclusive education because of their limitations in intellectual functioning, and (b) interrupt other students’ learning due to their problem behaviors.

The reviewed comments included parents’ voices. Parents of children with disabilities (n = 3) presented neither disagreement with the school’s expulsion nor advocacy for the student with ID. Instead, they appealed to the empathy of the negative commenters stating that they had no choice but sending their children to general education schools because special schools were already full. This was contrasted to the comments made by the parents of children without disabilities. They stated that inclusive education is unfair because it (a) makes their children tolerate problem behaviors of students with ID (e.g., spitting, swearing), and (b) interrupts effective education due to interruption caused by the problem behaviors.

Taken together, the right of students with ID to choose to attend a general education school might not necessarily protect their right to liberty when they are not free from social pressure against inclusive education. In other words, the current South Korean legal protections for choosing inclusive education might be vulnerable to social pressure. While South Korea law places inclusive education for students with disabilities as a matter of a choice, the United States legally mandates the LRE and then allows restrictive environments (e.g., special classes, special school) only when “the nature or severity of the disability of a child is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily” (20 U.S.C.)
§1412(a)(5)). This law creates a presumption of inclusive education and limits departure from inclusive education into separate education based on outcomes of inclusive education with the use of additional supports. An IDEA regulation specifically requires a decision of a group that includes not only parents but “other persons knowledgeable about the child, the meaning of the evaluation data, and the placement options” (34 CFR §300.116). In comparison to South Korean laws for inclusive education, this statute and regulations leave students with disabilities and their families less vulnerable to social pressure because they focus on needs of students with disabilities as determined by the team of people based on evaluation data (outcomes of inclusive education), not solely by parents based on community pressure and their own judgment.

**Inequalities to benefit all.** The second principle of Rawls’s theory is that “social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) reasonably expected to be to everyone’s advantage, and (b) attached to positions and offices open to all” (Rawls, 1999, p. 53). Rawls noted that equality does not require distributing the same amount of societal resources to everyone, but it is to benefit all people in terms of the accessibility to the resources. That is, equality is to provide equal access to social values such as “liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and the social bases of self-respect” rather than to distribute the equal amount of the resources to all members in a society (Rawls, 1999, p. 54).

According to this principle, it is fair to distribute educational resources unequally for the benefit of all students. The IDEA indicates that “the use of supplementary aids and services” should be provided before determining progress of a student with a disability in inclusive settings (20 U.S.C. §1412(a)(5)). Consistently, the IDEA regulation
§300.116 stipulates that separate education should not be considered “solely because of needed modifications in the general education curriculum.” This regulation implies that “needed modification in the general education curriculum” (additional academic supports) should be provided for inclusive education. Furthermore, the IDEA stipulates that an IEP should include a plan for access to the general curriculum for a child with a disability (20 U.S.C. §1414(d)(1)(A)).

In comparison, the ASED and its regulations do not require academic supports for inclusive education. Inclusive education in the ASED means that a child eligible for special education gets education suitable for his or her educational needs with typically developing children in a general education school without being discriminated on the basis of his or her disability. Ui-jung Kim and colleagues (2011) interpreted this legal definition as legal protection for the access to the general curriculum because the definition changed from targeting social adjustment of children with disabilities in physically integrated settings in the previous law to focusing on these children’s education with typically developing children. This interpretation might be possible if access to the general curriculum means exposure to the general curriculum. The legal definition of inclusive education and relevant regulations, however, does not require appropriate supports (e.g., curriculum modification, instructional supports) for students with disabilities to learn the general curriculum.

In addition, the ASED statute for an IEP emphasizes suitability of education goals, methods, contents, and related services for the diagnosis type and characteristics of the child’s disability without mandating a plan for access to the general curriculum (Act 2-7). According to the ASED Act 2-11, special class is defined as a classroom installed in
a general education school to promote inclusive education for students with disabilities. Although this law clarifies that the goal of a special education classroom is to support inclusive education, it did not specify how to support it. Similarly, the Act 8-2 and Act 21 of the ASED noted that a general education school should establish and implement an inclusive education plan, but it did not provide specific components of the plan. In short, there seems to be no legal protection in the ASED to ensure the provision of additional supports for students with disabilities to get access to the general curriculum.

The five-year plan for South Korean special education (South Korean Ministry of Education, 2017) included a plan for inclusive education but did not specify a support plan for access to the general curriculum. This plan involved (a) employing a large number of special education teachers to support inclusive education in a general education school, (b) developing a medical support team for problem behavior reduction and health care needs in school, (c) establishing a support center focusing on each disability diagnosis type, (d) strengthening art and sports programs, and (e) strengthening teacher training. These methods seem relevant to the educational benefits of students with disabilities through separate education within their general education school and possible benefits through training general education teachers. None of them, however, is directly related to provision of supplementary supports for students with disabilities to gain benefits in inclusive classes. The five-year plan did include development of a cooperation model for a general education teacher and a special education teacher, but it did not specify the goal of cooperation.

In summary, the South Korean laws and policy for inclusive education do not seem to follow Rawls’s second principle of justice. They did not protect provision of
additional supports for students with disabilities to benefit from inclusive classes as typically developing students do. This absence of outcome-oriented supports for inclusive education could make students with disabilities be in general education classes without learning. This may be acceptable, considering that many general education classes focus on most of the students’ learning rather than all students. This approach, however, violates Rawls’s second principle of justice because it does not focus on every student’s benefits and does not consider different distribution of educational supports for some students who might not benefit from a universal form of classes.

Confucianism. South Korea has a long history of Confucianism. Confucius (a.k.a. Kongzi), a politician and teacher in the 6th century BC in China, developed Confucianism (Bell, 2014). Confucianism was introduced to South Korea in the 4th century, and Confucian studies was the main curricula in Korean educational institutions for over 1,000 years after the introduction (Kang-Nyeong Kim, 2009). The influence of Confucianism was greatest in Korea during Joseon dynasty (1392-1910; Kang-Nyeong Kim, 2009; Youngchan Lee, 2007; J. H. Shin, 2016), the last Kingdom of Korea (S. Kang, 2016).

Confucianism tenet. Confucianism refers to a study of politics and ethics that pursues Confucian values (Kang-Nyeong Kim, 2009). It sets a high value on peaceful leadership, which means a ruler governs a country in a manner of showing the people ren (Chinese: 仁; Koh, 2003, p. 62). Ren is the ultimate virtue of Confucianism (H. Choi, 2008; S. Jin, 2008; W. Zhang, 1999), meaning “goodness, humanness, love, benevolence, human-heartedness, and humanity” (Oldstone-Moore, 2002, p. 55). This seems to
indicate that a Confucian society would expect a ruler or an authority to perform their roles with love for the ruled.

Confucian ethics are based on a hierarchy in human relationships and require people to respect the hierarchy (Tan, 2016). For example, a wife should respect her husband, a child should respect parents, and the ruled should respect the ruler (Oldstone-Moore, 2002). This Confucian hierarchical perspective on human relationships underlies the ethics. Confucius stratified humans into the following four classes: (a) top class of people who have knowledge from their birth, (b) second class of people who have knowledge after learning, (c) third class of people who have knowledge after learning with efforts, (d) and the ruled who do not gain knowledge after learning with effort (Confucius as cited by H. Jin, 2006). Mencius stated that people are divided into two groups from their birth: (a) people who like doing physical work, and (b) people appropriate for intellectual work (Mencius as cited by H. Jin, 2006). Mencius (a.k.a. Mengzi, 372–289 BC or 385–303 or 302 BC) is a great Chinese Confucian philosopher (“Mencius,” n. d.). Building on this classification, Mencius contended that the first group of people should be in charge of producing goods, and the second group of people should rule a country to maintain social order. H. Jin interpreted this discriminating position of Confucian scholars as reflecting the hierarchical society at that time. This perspective justified a hierarchical structure of a society during Joseon and provided a basis of ethics in relationships (H. Jin, 2006). Confucius theorized that harmony in human relationships is maintained by respecting “social hierarchy rules, status, and authorities” (Chinese Cultural Connection as cited by Y.B. Zhang et al., 2005, p. 108). In other words, respecting the relational hierarchy is the basis of socially appropriate interpersonal
behavior in a Confucian society. X. Xu (2015) named this type of behavioral code as “Respect for Authority” (p. 65).

This code of interpersonal behavior is relevant to the Confucian basic virtue named *li* (禮), which determines socially appropriate behavior in a Confucian society (M. Park & Chesla, 2007). *Li* is connected to the priority of social harmony over individuals’ wants and desires because harmony leads to desired social conformity (X. Xu, 2015). In addition to respect for authority, *li* also includes rules of Confucian rituals such as rituals of worshiping ancestors and funerals (J. Yu, 1998). This form of *li* remains in contemporary South Korea, even after its dissemination nearly 500 years ago in Joseon dynasty.

**Neo-Confucianism.** Out of different branches of Confucian studies, Neo-Confucianism (i.e., Chu Hsi’s Confucian study) was particularly dominant in the Joseon dynasty (G. Kim, 2014). Some Korean official scholars (e.g., *An Hyang*) who learned neo-Confucianism in China introduced it to Korea in the late Goryeo dynasty which was the kingdom before Joseon (S. Kang, 2016; Koh, 2003; Son, 2018). Neo-Confucianism is a branch of Confucianism that was dominant during the Chinese Song dynasty (960 - 1279). Other than its unique ontology, neo-Confucianism retained most of the virtues (e.g., *ren, li*) and value (e.g., harmony) that the early Confucian scholars (i.e., Confucius and Mencius) theorized (K. Hwang, 2013; B. H. Kim, 2014; Koh, 2003).

Neo-Confucianism views the world as having a universal moral truth, which is considered the inborn nature of all human beings (B. H. Kim, 2014). B. H. Kim stated that *li* (理), the only truth, consists of *ren* (仁), *yi* (義), *li* (禮), and *chih* (知) as Mencius theorized (Cline, 2007). *Ren* (仁) and *li* (禮) have the same meaning that I described
above. *Yi* refers to the sense of justice and righteousness (Murphy & Weber, 2016; M. Park & Chesla, 2007; J. Yu, 1998). The justice indicated by *yi* means harmony, not Rawls’s fairness as justice (Murphy & Weber, 2016). This virtue is associated with maintaining peaceful order as opposed to seeking an individual’s own profit against the social peace (Bell, 2017; Cline, 2007). *Li* (禮) is closely related to *yi* in that respecting social hierarchy would contribute to maintaining the harmony of the society according to the Confucian legacy (Huntington, 1991). *Chih* refers to the discernment of good and evil (D. Zhang, 2002). In addition to these four virtues, D. Zhang stated *shin* (信) as another neo-Confucian virtue. *Shin* was originally specified by Confucius and refers to an individual’s trustworthiness in social relationships (D. Zhang, 2002).

Mencius used metaphors to explain these virtues. He stated that human beings should grow sprouts (innate moral virtues) as a moral agent (Cline, 2007). Neo-Confucianism views human desires as evil if they conflict with any of those virtues (Kee-Hyon Kim, 2007). Thus, it emphasizes the importance of self-cultivation, which is cultivating one’s mind so that an individual can follow innate virtues rather than seek selfish desires (Park & Chesla, 2007). Self-cultivation refers to the process of setting an individual’s mind in the direction that is considered right based on neo-Confucianism (K. Hwang, 2013). This definition is the same as the neo-Confucian definition of education (K. Hwang, 2013). The primary method of self-cultivation is to internalize neo-Confucian knowledge through learning neo-Confucian studies (B. H. Kim, 2014; Kwag, 2017). Beyond building Confucian knowledge, learners are also required to exhibit the neo-Confucian virtuous behavior that they learned (K. Hwang, 2013).
Dominance of neo-Confucianism. The Joseon dynasty used neo-Confucianism to justify its establishment and to maintain social order while suppressing Buddhism which was Goryeo’s state religion (Kang-Nyeong Kim, 2009; B. H. Kim, 2014; Koh, 2003). The dynasty recruited governmental officials through national qualification exams that were based on neo-Confucian studies (W. Jo, 2003). In relation to these exams, the curricula of Joseon’s educational institutions focused on neo-Confucian studies. The dynasty also disseminated neo-Confucian family rituals (J. Choi, 2016) and ethics to the people across the country (Min, 2017).

Furthermore, the Joseon dynasty required local governments to strengthen the national governmental authority based on neo-Confucianism (Gwon, 2016). As noted by Gwon, officials called Su-ryoung were assigned to each district for taxation, imposing duties, and doing other office work in the district. Each district had different regulations called Hangyak, which commonly included neo-Confucian ethics such as respecting parents and rulers and cooperation between residents (Hwang, 2007). Assigned officials (i.e., Su-ryoung) administered physical punishment and rewards to residents of the district based on Hangyak because dissemination of Confucian ethics was one of their jobs (Hwang, 2007; Shi, 2007). This system assessed residents’ daily behavior in a more detailed manner when compared to the national punishment and reward system (Jee, 1996). Another aspect of the work of these officials was promoting local educational institutions, and thus they established and managed local schools called Hanggyo (Y. Kwon, 2016; Bum-chig Lee, 1976; Shi, 2007). I describe more about Hanggyo under the subtitle of educational institutions and system.
In 1434 King Sejong published a book, *Samganghaengsildo* (Korean), written with Idu scripts and with pictures to help readers understand neo-Confucian ethics (Eun-hee Lee & Yang, 2017). Using pictures was not a new strategy. *Hyohaengrok* (Korean), the book of exemplar behaviors that showed filial piety, included pictures, and children disseminated its contents by singing (S. M. Lee, 2017). *Samganghaengsildo*, however, was different from the books published earlier in that (a) pictures occupied a similar number of the pages to that of written descriptions, and (b) the pictures displayed the whole descriptions rather than a part of them (M. Kang, 2005). The use of pictures in *Samganghaengsildo* may be seen as a way of instructional supports for people who have limitations in using language for communication to understand the book.

King Sejong was motivated to publish this book by one incident, in which an individual (called Kimhwa) killed his father in 1428 (Annals of the Joseon Dynasty as cited by Eun-hee Lee & Yang, 2017; D. Paek, 2009). This incident was a serious violation of an important Confucian behavioral code, respecting parents. Eun-hee Lee and Yang noted that King Sejong aimed at edifying the common people through the dissemination of this book. He also assigned literate people to governmental positions so that they taught the book contents to the common people because he thought providing the book itself would not be effective in helping the people’s learning (Eun-hee Lee & Yang, 2017). Given this, I believe that King Sejong’s efforts for teaching Confucian ethics were associated with instructional supports such as task modification (e.g., using pictures, simplifying written descriptions) and provision of tutoring.

*Samganghaengsildo* described vertical ethics in three human relationships (Academy of Korean Studies, 1991; Min, 2017). *Samganghaensil* means three codes of
behavior in relationships, and *do* refers to pictures. As seen in the meanings of its title, this book consisted of a picture, a short description, and a praise of each good behavior as determined by the following three Confucian virtues: (a) loyalty in sovereign-subject relationships, (b) filial piety in parent-child relationships, and (c) faithfulness in husband-wife relationships (Academy of Korean Studies, 1991). The reason for considering these ethics vertical is that these virtues require the obedience of individuals in lower positions in the relationships (i.e., a subject, a child, a wife), from the Confucian perspective (M. Kang, 2005). *Samganghaengsildo* is one of the books that was most frequently published and disseminated during the Joseon dynasty (Yun, 2015).

The Joseon dynasty had a hierarchical social structure. Although this class system had some changes, the system itself remained, no matter which individuals ruled the country, until the Joseon dynasty fell in the early 20th Century (B. Cho, 1997; Kang-Nyeong Kim, 2009; D. Y. Ryu, 2014). The Joseon dynasty had a four-class system that consisted of (a) nobles called *yangban*; (b) middle (e.g., doctors, people born from a noble man’s concubine); (c) common class (e.g., farmers, merchants, craftsmen); and (d) low class (e.g., entertainers, slaves, shamans, slaughterers; e.g., Jeon, 2015; Park, 2001). Seongmu Lee (2009) noted that people in the common class were allowed to gain higher classes by passing a national qualification exam for a governmental position. For example, they could gain the middle class by passing a national qualification exam for governmental technicians. They could become *yangban* (noble class) if they took a governmental or military position after passing a national qualification exam.

Most of the national qualification exams mainly addressed neo-Confucian studies, and the Joseon’s educational institutions had neo-Confucian curriculum consistent with
these exams (C. Kim, 2011). These educational institutions were open to all classes of people except those in the lowest class (M. Kim, 1995; C. Kim, 2011; Seo, 2004). J. S. Yu (2014), however, discovered that people in the lowest class who made some contributions to Joseon were allowed to access educational institutions as well. According to historical records J. S. Yu presented, some of these people took a governmental position by passing national qualification exams.

King Sejong the Great invented the Korean alphabet, *Hunminjeongum* (Korean), with eight scholars 10 years after publishing *Samganghaengsildo* (January 1444; Eokcheol Lee & Jeon, 1987). The Joseon dynasty used Chinese characters as its written language (O. K. Kim, 1987). Most of the people were illiterate before the invention of the Korean alphabet in the 15th century (Eun-hee Lee & Yang, 2017). *Hunmin* means teaching the people, and *jeongum* refers to right sounds that are written using the invented scripts (C. Kim, 2011; Eok-cheol Lee & Jeon, 1987). As seen in its meaning, the purpose of *Hunminjeongum* was to help the people easily acquire written language so that they could live a more convenient life than before (Hwang, 2007).

Hwang (2007) noted two contributions of the invention of the Korean alphabet (now called *Hangul*). One was the enlightenment of the people. The other was opening opportunities for them to learn social regulations and Confucian virtues using language rather than learning by experiencing physical punishment and rewards that the government had used before the invention of *Hunminjeongum* (Jee, 1996). This seems to be supported by the records of King Sejong (*Sejong Silok*, Korean) that were made before his invention of the Korean alphabet. The King felt sorry about using punishment for the people who committed crimes without knowing laws because they were illiterate (*Sejong
Silok as cited by Eun-hee Lee & Yang, 2017). Eun-hee Lee and Yang stated another purpose of *Hunminjeongum* was for the common people to make a written appeal so that they could have a reasonable resolution of their social problems (Eun-hee Lee & Yang, 2017).

Eun-hee Lee and Yang (2017) interpreted King Sejong’s invention of the Korean alphabet as a manifestation of the ruler’s benevolence toward the ruled (i.e., *ren*; the main Confucian virtue for the rulers). From the perspective of Confucianism, *Hunminjeongum* could be the outcome of the ruler’s benevolence. The invention of *Hunminjeongum*, on the other hand, could be viewed as a fulfillment of fair access to knowledge from the perspective of Rawls’s justice as fairness. Some noble men (e.g., Manri Choi) opposed dissemination of *Hunminjeongum* advocating for the scholarly superiority of Chinese over *Hangul* (Eok-cheol Lee & Jeon, 1987). Their real reason for this opposition, however, might be related to concerns about losing their privileged social position to the common people because the people were more likely to pass the national qualification exam for recruiting officials if *Hangul* could be used to understand Confucian books (e.g., Eun-hee Lee & Yang, 2017; Oh, 2008; Shi, 2007). Therefore, the noble men’s opposition might be associated with the monopoly of knowledge and thus, the unfairness of knowledge distribution. King Sejong succeeded in defending dissemination of *Hunminjeongum* against these opponents (Eun-hee Lee & Yang, 2017).

Once King Sejong formally proclaimed *Hunminjeongum*, noble men first acquired it and then gradually the people in lower classes came to learn it (Shi, 2007). Eun-hee Lee and Yang (2017) stated that noble men’s acquisition of *Hunminjeongum* was crucially influenced by changes to the national qualification exam for recruiting officials, from
using Chinese only to requiring the use of *Hunminjeongum* or making *Hunminjeongum* available upon selection. There have been few recordings of educational strategies used for teaching *Hunminjeongum*, but it has been known that people in noble classes including women and children learned this language at home or via private educational institutions (Shi, 2007).

It seems unclear how people in lower classes learned *Hunminjeongum* in the 16th century when it began to be disseminated. Eun-hee Lee and Yang (2017) described that King Sejong commanded different educational institutions to teach *Hunminjeongum*, but these scholars did not note supporting resources and any examples of those institutions. Shi (2007) stated that they learned it at private elementary educational institutions in each town (i.e., *Seodang*). M. Kim (1995), however, noted that *Seodang* was more likely to educate noble men’s children rather than the common people in the 16th century and became open to people in lower classes in the 17th century. A Joseon statute allowed the common people to attend educational institutions in the 16th century, but there was no public educational institution at that time (*Gyeongguk daejeon* as cited by M. Kim, 1995).

According to the guidebook of *Hunminjeongum* (called *Hunminjeongum Heareabon*, 1446), *Hunminjeongum* is easy enough for wise people to learn within a day and for the foolish to acquire for 10 days (C. Kim, 2011). Given this, it seems that the common people may not have had difficulty learning *Hunminjeongum* though educational strategies for teaching it were not clearly documented. Scholars revealed historical records showing that people in low classes were able to read books written in *Hunminjeongum*. For example, Hwang (2007) noted that people in low classes and even slaves read Confucian books translated into *Hunminjeongum*. He presumed that
individuals in low classes might have taken turns reading the books rather than possessing them.

Although King Sejong tried to translate Confucian books such as Analects and Mencius into *Hunminjeongum*, the translations were completed far later (Paek, 2009). Paek stated that Sejong intended to spread Confucian ideology out to the people by disseminating the translated version of these books. Joseon’s ninth king, Seongjong (ruled from 1470 to 1494), commanded (a) translation of *Samganghaengsildo* into *Hunminjeongum* and (b) teaching the book to the people including women and children by noble men or officials in charge of teaching called *gyosoo* or *hoondo* (*Gyeongguk daejeon* as cited by Shi, 2007). The king awarded a prize on the basis of governors’ reports to those who showed exemplary virtuous behavior as they taught with *Samganghaengsildo* (*Gyeongguk daejeon* as cited by M. Kim, 1995). Joseon translated other Confucian books into *Hunminjeongum* and disseminated these books to edify the people (Eun-hee Lee & Yang, 2017). These books provided Confucian ways of self-cultivation and Confucian ethics in daily life (Eun-hee Lee & Yang, 2017).

Neo-Confucian family rituals were disseminated from the beginning of the Joseon dynasty and observed by most of the people in low classes at the end of the dynasty (J. Choi, 2016). These rituals included the ways of doing a coming-of-age ceremony, wedding, funeral, and worship of ancestors (J. Choi, 2016; Jang, 2012). The Joseon dynasty disseminated these rituals to spread neo-Confucian ideology across the nation while suppressing other religions (e.g., Buddhism, Taoism, shamanism) to strengthen the new dynasty’s authority (Dae-Yong Kim as cited by Hwang, 2007). G. Lee (1983) noted that a book of neo-Confucian family rituals (*Jujagarea*) was one of the
textbooks used in *Hanggyo*. Neo-Confucian rituals remained in Korean traditional culture, though they were modified over time (J. Choi, 2016; Heejae Lee, 2008).

**Decline of neo-Confucianism.** Neo-Confucianism gradually declined from the mid-Joseon period for academic, political, and social reasons. During this period, neo-Confucian scholars were divided into two groups based on how they theorized *li* (禮; respect for relational hierarchy regarding ages and authority), and this division was linked to political parties in the 16th century (Feng, 2009). K. P. Yang and Henderson (1958) stated that this division is relevant to the beginning of current political factionalism in South Korea. The conflicts between the political parties became serious as the number of governmental positions was reduced (Baek-hoon Lee, 1979; Feng, 2009).

The Joseon’s economic problems after its defense against Japanese (twice in 1592 and 1598) and Manchu invasions (1627-1637) led to instability of its class system (Baek-hoon Lee, 1979; O. K. Kim, 1989). *Gyeongguk daejeon* (a complete code of Joseon’s law) restricted promotion of governmental positions for people in the middle class (e.g., *Hang-li*, *Yeok-li*), inhibited *Seo-eol* (another category of those in the middle class) and people in the low class from gaining governmental positions, and ensured privileges of *yangban* such as waivers of criminal penalty (Chon, 2009). As noted by Chon, this legal system, however, was weakened as people traded *yangban* class for money, and the government allowed *Seo-eol* to gain governmental positions if they paid with rice. Furthermore, non-*yangban* people who built wealth from selling items created a nationwide association to protect their rights and profits and exercised their power against the government (Baek-hoon Lee, 1979). Taken together, the government began to lose its justification of the class system and to have difficulty maintaining the discriminatory

Some neo-Confucian scholars sought a new ideology after the invasions from Japan and the Manchu (Jae-jeong Park, 2003). As noted by Jae-jeong Park (2003), Western Learning (Seohak) inspired these scholars to focus on pragmatic studies. Western Learning refers to western studies (e.g., astronomy, geography, medicine) and Catholicism (H. M. Lee, 2012). This study started as Joseon’s envoys brought relevant books from China in the 17th century or early 18th century (H. M. Lee, 2012). Some neo-Confucian scholars (e.g., Yi-ik, Daeyong Hong) were interested in studying western science (C. B. Cho, 2015; Major & Major, 2012). The study by this group of scholars is called Silhak, characterized as “reformism, pragmatism, and scientism” (O. K. Kim, 1989, p. 90). In addition, access to a map of the world changed the Joseon people’s world view by showing that China is only one of the many countries (H. M. Lee, 2012). As noted by H. M. Lee, this map discouraged the belief of Joseon’s neo-Confucian scholars that China was the greatest in the world because it was the place where Confucianism and neo-Confucianism originated.

The Joseon government prevented the dissemination of Catholic books and the people’s conversion to Catholicism (Kwang Cho, 2006; K. Lee, 2018; Jae-jeong Park, 2003; B. Shin, 1997). Neo-Confucian advocates for this prohibition believed that only neo-Confucianism was the right study, and all others were cunning (Feng, 2009; Jae-jeong Park, 2003). Particularly, Catholic doctrine such as God’s authority over the king, human equality, and denial of ancestor worship threatened neo-Confucian ideology that justified and maintained the Joseon government (e.g., loyalty to the king, the class
system, neo-Confucian rituals; Kwang Cho, 2006; Feng, 2009; B. Shin, 1997; Jae-jeong Park, 2003). According to historical sources, Catholic believers initially consisted of some people in yangban and a few in lower classes but became more prevalent among non-yangban people in the 19th century as the Joseon dynasty persecuted Catholic believers (Feng, 2009; Jae-jeong Park, 2003). During this period, Choe Je-u, a man in the middle class as Seo-ol, founded Donghak (meaning Eastern studies) that advocated for human equality, but the Joseon dynasty persecuted it as well (S. Han & Lee, 2005).

Neo-Confucianism came to decline with the downfall of the Joseon dynasty when Japan began to colonize Korea in 1910 (Kyung-ho Kim, 2015; Major & Major, 2010). During the Japanese colonization (1910-1945), Japan abolished the Joseon’s class system and tried to reduce the power of neo-Confucian scholars in order to strengthen Japanese governance of Korea (Dong-chun Kim, 2002; Kyung-ho Kim, 2015). For example, Japan closed the national institution for higher neo-Confucian education in Joseon (i.e., Seongkyunkwan; Kyung-ho Kim, 2015; Soon-seok Kim, 2013) and forced the people to use Japanese, prohibiting the use of Korean and Chinese (Y. Choi, 2006). Japan also used neo-Confucian ethics in a ruler-subordinate relationship but switched the Joseon’s king with the Japanese governor in Korea (e.g., loyalty to the Japanese governor, fathership of the Japanese governor) so that Japan could justify its invasion and make Korean people follow its governance (Dong-chun Kim, 2002).

Korea was governed by the Soviet Union for its north area, and the U.S. for the south part, after its liberation from Japan in 1945 (Jeong-Kyu Lee, 2001). South Korea became the Republic of Korea on August 15, 1948, three years later (Jeong-Kyu Lee, 2001). Although the civil society opened to South Korean people at that time, some assert
that they were not yet prepared for exercising citizenship since citizenship was given to them without their efforts (Hyesook Lee, 2014).

Later, some military elites staged a coup and ruled South Korea for about 20 years (1961-1979). South Korean people were again ruled by an authoritarian government, postponing learning to use the rights of citizenship (O. Choi, 1988). Park Chung-hee, the ruler during this period, commanded that schools teach conformity to the government, incorporating Confucian values into school education (Kwang-Seung Choi, 2014; K. Chang, 1997). President Park used Confucian leadership, based on benevolence and hierarchical ethics between subjects and the ruler and rapidly achieved success in growing the South Korean economy (Sooyoung Park, 2012).

**Confucian culture in contemporary South Korea.** Confucianism still influences contemporary Korean people’s values either consciously or unconsciously (Chin, 2018; Śleziak, 2013; Y. B. Zhang et al., 2005). Recent national data collected from 49,052,389 South Koreans (Korean Statistical Information Service, 2017) showed that only 0.2% of the people identified their religion as Confucianism, and the majority of them (56.1%) identified themselves as atheists. Scholars, however, have documented that Confucianism continues to be the basis of ethics and organizational culture in South Korea (e.g., Jeong-Kyu Lee, 2001; I. W, Jun & Rowly, 2014; Daewook Kim & Choi, 2013).

Confucian ethics in five relationships (i.e., *Samgangoryun*) is the manifestation of Confucianism in modern South Korea (e.g., H. Park, Rehg, & Lee, 2005). These ethics include (a) children’s respect for parents and parents’ care for children, (b) loyalty of subjects to leaders, (c) role distinction between a husband and a wife, (d) respect for and politeness to older people, and (e) trust between friends. The basic logic of this
interpersonal behavior code is mutual responsibilities in relationships under a hierarchy (Jeong-Kyu Lee, 2001; Sunghee Park & Lunt, 2015) and extension of family ethics to a society (Dong-sik Kim, 1998; S. Jin, 2008). A recent national survey on South Koreans’ conscience and values ($n = 5,000$; Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism, 2016) indicated that many South Koreans (84.6% of the respondents) positively perceived the traditional ethics (e.g., filial piety, loyalty).

**Confucianism and motherhood.** Confucian ethics in husband-wife relationships are built on husbands’ superiority (I. H. Park & Cho, 1995) and indicates caregiving as wives’ primary role in a family (Oldstone-Moore, 2002). The influx of western culture and changes in family form (from extended family to nuclear family), however, have weakened this patriarchal family culture (Young-Shin Park & Kim, 2006). South Korean women (mother/ wife) were previously supposed to respect and obey the decision of men (father/ husband), but they are more likely to engage in decision-making with similar power to men’s authority (Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism, 2016). Bell interpreted this phenomenon with a focus on the Confucian practical purpose of the hierarchical relationship. Husbands took leading positions over wives because men were mainly in charge of finding food such as hunting and farming in ancient times. This hierarchy has been weakened because many women are now also involved in making money for a living in a modern society.

Nevertheless, caregiving is still considered mothers’ primary role in South Korean families (Seungju Lee & Lee, 2017; Jong-sik Park, 2013; You & McGraw, 2011). J. Ryu (2007) pointed out that South Korean parents are likely to identify themselves with their children under the influence of Confucianism. Similarly, Young-Shin Park and Kim
(2006) stated that many Korean parents consider their children as “extensions of themselves” (p. 425). Parents who equate themselves with their children might feel children’s pain as if the pain is on them, and they may perceive children’s achievement as theirs (Poon-McBrayer & McBrayer, 2014; J. Ryu, 2007; You & McGraw, 2011) and be willing to sacrifice themselves for their children (Young-Shin Park & Kim, 2006). This phenomenon would be influenced by parents’ responsibilities for children as a superior obligation (e.g., education, care, affection) that Samgangoryun mandated (You & McGraw, 2011). Given that Confucianism views an individual based on societal members’ interrelatedness rather than an independent entity (Uichol Kim & Choi, 2014), interrelatedness between parents and children could be another reason for this strong emotional identification of parent-child relationships in South Korea.

Confucianism in student-teacher relationships. Confucianism requires teachers to have a higher level of morality than other professionals, and being a teacher in a Confucian society is a well-paid and respected job (Li, 2012). As noted by Li, this is associated with high values of education in Confucianism. South Korean teachers also are well-paid and typically receive relatively high respect from others. This is contrasted with non-Confucian societies (e.g., Western countries) where many teachers have low pay and low respect (Li, 2012).

Jeong-Kyu Lee (2001) noted that South Korean student-teacher relationships might mirror father-child relationships. This scholar stated that the Confucian ethical legacy (i.e., an extension of family ethics to the society) might be the primary reason for this phenomenon. Students follow teachers as they do and expect teachers to benefit them as their father does for them (Janelli as cited by Jeong-Kyu Lee, 2001). Moon and
McCluskey (2016) agreed that Confucian student-teacher relationships in South Korea used to be the traditional form, but they revealed that many students recently are challenging teachers’ authority, and that this issue was more seriously shown in middle schools and vocational high schools as compared to academic high schools. Although Confucian ethics might no longer be dominant in student-teacher relationships in contemporary South Korean schools, the traditional type of student-teacher relationships may continue to appear in parent-teacher relationships. Particularly, parents who identify themselves with their children might expect teachers to be benevolent to both them and their children, and consequently not take actions to gain appropriate supports for their children.

**Disability and Confucianism.** Harmony is the ideal of Confucianism as Confucian justice (Bell, 2017; Murphy & Weber, 2016; Y. B. Zhang et al., 2005). While a disability is considered a natural part of human experience in America, Confucianism views a disability itself as disharmony (He as cited by Y. Zhang & Rosen, 2018) and a cause of disharmony (Holroyd, 2003). In Confucian belief, a disability is given because of the family’s fault for worshiping ancestors inappropriately (M. Chang & Hsu, 2006) or a mother’s careless behavior (Holroyd, 2003). Research has documented that mothers of a child with a disability in East Asian countries influenced by Confucianism felt shame and blamed themselves regarding their child’s disability (e.g., Holroyd, 2003; Huang, Kellett, & John, 2010; Poon-McBrayer & McBrayer, 2014).

You and McGraw (2011), however, reported that participant mothers living in a capital city in South Korea refused to be blamed for their children’s disabilities. This research may suggest that Confucian values might differently influence mothers’
thoughts depending on their living areas. Young-Shin Park and Kim (2006) listed changes in values according to urbanization. They stated that South Korea traditionally had past-oriented, ancestor-related, and conservative values, but moved forward to future-oriented, children-centered, and progress-based values with its urbanization.

As discussed earlier, the Confucian way of maintaining harmony is to respect the hierarchy of human relationships and to be reciprocally responsible for moral duties related to their status in the relationship hierarchy. Y. Zhang and Rosen (2018) stated that people with disabilities are in an inferior status that needs benevolence from those in a superior status based on Confucianism. From this perspective, education for children with disabilities would be considered a matter of sympathy and charity (S. Q. Xu, Cooper, & Sin, 2018). Benevolence is a human disposition, and sympathy and charity are emotions produced by the disposition (Y. Zhang & Rosen, 2018). Either the disposition or the emotions would not be taken as responsibilities of educational staff. Furthermore, considering that human emotions inherently change depending on contexts, a benevolence-based approach to education is less likely to produce professional effort (e.g., using effective teaching strategies) consistently (S. Q. Xu et al., 2018). A benevolence approach is also more likely to focus on deficits rather than learners’ strengths and preferences (Bak, 1999).

With benevolence-based education, it might be difficult for parents and children with disabilities to ask for appropriate supports to make educational progress. This is because receivers of benevolence are supposed to appreciate any benevolent behavior without evaluating its quality. Likewise, this approach seems to be an obstacle to effective inclusive education because it overlooks “the fact that education is a human
right” (Y. Zhang & Rosen, 2018, p. 117). Futaba (2016) reported a case of successful inclusive education in Japan where Confucianism is embedded in culture and daily ethics, similarly to South Korea (H. Han et al., 2018). The main factor of the successful inclusive education was noted as the school’s rights-based approach to education. The school principal, teachers, parents, and students collaborated with each other to ensure all students’ learning. Given this, it seems that schools in a Confucian society could promote inclusive education by pursuing harmony (the ultimate value of Confucianism) with all school members and parents in order to protect the right to education for all students. In order to do, it would be necessary to (a) change a conscious or unconscious Confucian perspective on human relationships from hierarchy into equality, and (b) respect individuals’ differences as diversity.

Another barrier to inclusive education would be examination-oriented education in South Korea. This type of education has been known to have originated from the Joseon dynasty (S. H. Chung, & Bae, 2017; Ju-Byung Park, 2017). The Joseon had a national examination based on Confucian studies to recruit intelligent government officials. Education for this exam was valued because people could gain a higher social class and bring honors and privileges to their family if they passed the exam (Seongmu Lee, 2009). This practical reason still seems to affect college examination-oriented education in South Korea (S. H. Chung, & Bae, 2017; Seth, 2012; Śleziak, 2013). South Koreans are likely to have different career choices depending on which colleges they graduated from (Uichol Kim, & Park, 2008). It was also reported that higher levels of colleges had “a sorting effect” that could function as proof of competency in job markets in South Korea (Sanghoon Lee, 2007, p. 793). Sanghoon Lee noted that this sorting effect
based on levels of colleges was greater than personal achievement in colleges in South Korea.

As noted by S. Q. Xu et al. (2018), relative examination involves competition between candidates, and thus examination-oriented education is likely to produce a competitive school climate (Poocharoen & Brillantes, 2013; S. Q. Xu et al., 2018). This educational system focuses on individuals’ academic achievement relative to others’ achievement rather than “personal development” because it was originally designed to select more intelligent people for restricted positions (S. Q. Xu et al., 2018, p. 67). Given that students with ID have some difficulties with intellectual functioning, they would hardly survive this type of competition. Also, school members are less likely to view ID as one part of human diversity if they highly value relative academic achievement. Teachers might have low academic expectations for students with ID who consistently show low achievement, rather than consider appropriate supports for the students’ progress.

**Rawls’s Justice vs. Confucian Justice.** Justice is a distributive principle for social systems (Rawls, 1971/1999). How justice is defined in a society determines how the society allocates “rights and duties and opportunities and privileges” to its members (Rawls, 1999, p.23). Rawls defined justice as fair distribution of social goods so that individuals’ rights are protected. Rawls conceptualized “well-ordered society” as a society that (a) maintains the order based on “public conception of justice” and (b) improves its members’ interests (p. 397). The conception of justice consists of two principles that protect equal opportunities and the allocation of additional goods for people with low natural assets. *Seo-eol*
Confucian justice focuses more on harmony rather than fairness (Murphy & Weber, 2016). As noted by Li (2008), the goal of Confucian harmony is to attain “the collective good” by balancing it with individuals’ interests (p. 433). When there are conflicts between the common good and an individual’s interests, a Confucian society is likely to achieve harmony by sacrificing the individual’s good (Li, 2008). Confucius stated, “The jun zi [morally refined person] harmonizes but does not seek sameness, whereas the petty person seeks sameness but does not harmonize” (Analects 13.23 as translated by Li, 2008, p. 426). Not only the priority of the common good, it is also the method of maintaining Confucian harmony that individuals respect the Confucian relational hierarchy (e.g., rulers over subordinates) and observe Confucian ethics in the relationships (e.g., rulers’ benevolence, subordinates’ loyalty; Li, 2008; Murphy & Weber, 2016). Taken together, Confucianism and Rawls have different conceptions of justice, and a Confucian harmonious society is differently designed from a Rawls’s well-ordered society.

One reason for these differences would be a different ontology of these theories. Rawls’s theory of justice focused on an individual who exists in a society as an independent entity, and thus, Rawls’s justice was to protect an individual’s equal rights. In other words, an individual is not interdependent on members of contemporary society in Rawls’s theory of justice (p. 181). From a Confucian perspective, an individual exists “in a web of social relationships” where the person is interrelated to others (Chan, 1999, p. 217; Seung-hwan Lee, 1992; Li, 2012). An individual is identified as “a son or daughter, brother or sister, wife or mother, husband or father, elder or junior first” (Wen & Akina, 2012, p. 400). Confucianism defines justice as harmony between the society
members through each member’s virtuous behavior for people in his or her relationships (Seung-hwan Lee, 1992).

**References to justice.** Rawls (1971/1999) required using a *veil of ignorance* to determine justice so that an individual uses innate moral law (i.e., natural law) only without considering his or her own benefits. Confucianism agrees with the exclusion of personal benefits to determine justice. Cline (2007) cited Confucius’s statement, “The junzi (“exemplary person”) cherishes *virtue*, whereas the petty person cherishes [his] land” (p. 369). “Land” represents personal interests, and virtue is the Confucian way of deciding justice. As interpreted by Cline, this Confucian statement shows that personal benefit should be excluded in a just decision.

Virtue is an additional reference for Confucian justice. Virtuous behavior in Confucianism is not a single code of behavior that people equally follow. Confucian codes of virtuous behavior are differently determined on the basis of an individual’s role in a relationship (Seung-hwan Lee, 1992). For example, parents’ virtuous behavior is to care for children, and filial piety is a child’s virtuous behavior. As stated before, this behavior code is extended to other social relationships. For example, subordinates’ virtuous behavior is loyalty-based behavior, and leaders should show benevolent behavior for subordinates.

Using Confucian virtues for justice, therefore, would involve that people consider their interpersonal position to identify the right code of virtuous behavior. These virtues might interfere with Rawls’s original position that is required for using the veil of ignorance. The original position is a hypothetical circumstance where an individual uses innate moral law (i.e., “a sense of justice,” Rawls, 1999, p. 11) only, free from personal
interests and social positions. There is an Analects script that seems consistent with the logic of Rawls’s original position. Confucius stated in Analects 15:23, “what you do not want to be done to yourself, do not do to others” (Confucius as cited by Wen & Akina, 2012, p. 400). Cline (2007) called this script as “the principle of reversibility” because it encourages an individual to sympathetically think about others’ position to identify just behavior. This principle seems similar to Rawls’s original position in that justice is determined based on an individual’s innate moral law without considering self-interests.

Rawls’s original position, however, is obviously different from the Confucian principle of reversibility. Rawls’s (1971/1999) veil of ignorance covers any moral doctrines that is dominant in the society, and thus, an individual would be free from Confucian moral virtues on Rawls’s original position.

Now it seems that equal liberty of conscience is the only principle that the person in the original position can acknowledge. They cannot take chances with their liberty by permitting the dominant religious or moral doctrine to persecute or to suppress others if it wishes. (Rawls, 1999, p. 181)

As seen in the Rawls’s statement above, an individual would identify justice solely based on his or her natural laws, and there is no room for Confucian moral doctrine (i.e., Confucian virtues) in Rawls’s original position. Confucianism, on the other hand, enables its virtues to play a critical role in determining justice when its principle of reversibility is used. The virtues seem to have greater impact on justice than human natural laws do.

Confucius told his students a story of “Upright Gong” who accused a father of stealing a sheep and then blamed Gong for not hiding his father’s fault. He then stated, “Among my people, those who we consider ‘upright’ are different from this: fathers cover for their
sons, and sons cover for their fathers” (Confucius as cited by Cline, 2007). Confucius taught his students that virtuous behavior for people in close relationships (e.g., family, friends) outweighs virtues for strangers (Li, 2012). Using Rawls’s ignorance of veil on the original position, Upright Gong’s behavior would be just behavior because the sheep owner’s loss is considered (Cline, 2007).

**Rawlsian advocacy and Confucian advocacy.** Advocacy including self-advocacy seems to take different forms in Rawls’s theory of justice and Confucianism. Rawls would guide an individual’s advocacy based on his or her legal rights. This advocacy would use laws where the individual’s rights are specified and might involve litigation to achieve equal protection of laws. Confucian advocacy, however, is likely to employ laws as a default strategy (Chan, 1999; Cline, 2007; X. Xu, 2015). Confucianism prefers “concession and compromise” to the assertion of rights (Chan, 1999, p. 250). According to Chan, Confucius viewed concession as “the most desirable virtue for social harmony” (p. 255). Confucian advocacy seems to involve passive or indirect forms such as giving a reminder of virtuous behavior (Chan, 1999) and making an appeal to a relevant person’s affection and benevolence (Dong-chun Kim, 2002; Donghee Lee, 2005). One reason for this form of advocacy might be relevant to the nature of virtuous behavior that rests on individuals’ autonomy (He, 2004).

Confucian virtue-based advocacy involves respect for unequal rights. Virtues are assigned to individuals depending on their social role that is linked to a relative position in a hierarchy of Confucian society (Seung-hwan Lee, 1992). This hierarchy is apparent in Confucian ethics in five relationships (Samgangoryun). For instance, a father has a higher position than a son, and a leader’s position is higher than the subordinates’
position. The hierarchy of a Confucian society might be used for strengthening rulers’ power, but exploitation of high classes is judged to be a violation of Confucian virtues (Ackerly, 2005). The original purpose of the hierarchy was to maintain social order efficiently (Huntington, 1991; Tan, 2016). Confucian virtues are different from Rawls’s rights that are equally given to all citizens. This is because Confucian virtues reflect an individual’s relational position.

Legal rights provide an “internal boundary” that individuals “must respect” (He, 2004, p. 114), whereas Confucian virtues have no strict boundary. For this reason, it might be easier to determine whether his or her rights are protected or violated than to determine whether his or her counterpart engages in appropriate virtuous behavior. Rights provide a right-holder with a formal position “to make a justified claim or demand, not merely a request for charity or benevolence, against the duty-bearer” (Seung-hwan Lee, 1992, p. 245). When using virtue-based advocacy, however, it might be considered better to maintain an individual’s social relationship with the counterpart than to assert the individual’s right (Seung-hwan Lee, 1992).

**Confucian vs. Rawlsian perspective on support needs.** According to Confucianism, an individual is believed to have equal potential for moral virtues but gain different levels of virtues depending on their efforts and talent (Li, 2012). Mencius stated that all humans are born with four virtue sprouts (i.e., benevolence, rightness, rituals of propriety, and discernment of good and evil) that they should grow (Cline, 2007). Education is a primary means of cultivating these Confucian virtues. Confucianism, therefore, emphasizes equal access to education regardless of individuals’ social classes
to develop innate virtues (Li, 2012). Confucius also placed great importance on
individuals’ efforts for educational achievement. He stated,

If other people can get things done by one portion of effort, we exert one hundred
portions of effort. If other people can get things done by one hundred portions of
effort, we exert one thousand portions of effort. If we really can do this, we
become enlightened even if we are born stupid. (Confucius as cited by Li, 2012,
p. 300)

As seen in the last sentence, Confucius agreed that individuals are born with an unequal
talent that might lead to different educational outcomes. He, however, insisted that great
efforts could overcome personal difficulties with learning. Confucius also stated, “only
the very wise and very stupid never change” (Analects 17:3 an translated by Li, 2012, p.
298). These scripts seem to indicate that Confucius (a) had low expectations for people
who showed relatively lowest achievement after having equal access to education and (b)
did not consider unequal achievement as resulting from different support needs. This
Confucian approach to education matches “the meritocratic conception” that involves
equal access to education and unequal achievement based on personal efforts and talent
(B Brighamouse as cited by Calvert, 2015, p. 988). Rawls (1991) criticized this approach
stating that this type of equality is based on the principle of efficiency that allocates social
values or goods “in a fair way whatever this allocation turns out to be” (pp. 57-58).

Rawls (1971/1999) objected to the meritocratic conception using his difference
principle. He viewed differences in individuals’ talents as unequal distribution of “native
assets” that should “be compensated for” (Rawls, 1999, p. 86). Therefore, it is justice that
people with “fewer native assets” have more “resources in education” so that they “enjoy
the culture of his society and to take part in its affairs, and in this way to provide for each individual a secure sense of his own worth” (Rawls, 1999, p. 87).

As stated by Rawls, this difference principle is connected to his second principle: “social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) reasonably expected to be to everyone’s advantage, and (b) attached to positions and offices open to all” (Rawls, 1999, p. 53). Equality is to provide equal access to social values for “everyone’s advantages,” not merely to make the values “equally open to all” (Rawls, 1999, p. 57). The latter concept of equality (i.e., equally open to all) is consistent with a Confucian emphasis on equal opportunity to an education that might involve low achievement and subsequently low expectations because of an individual’s natural difficulties in learning. Confucian justice, however, does not have the former aspect of equality and accepts the meritocratic conception.

As noted by Schalock et al. (2010), students with ID experience “significant limitations both in intellectual functioning and in adaptive behavior” (Shalock et al., 2010, p. 6). The limitations in intellectual functioning include difficulties with comprehension of surroundings such as “catching on, making sense of things, or figuring out what to do” (Shalock et al., 2010, p. 15). The limitations in adaptive behavior encompass difficulties with the following skills.

- **Conceptual skills**: language; reading and writing; and money, time, and number concepts

- **Social skills**: interpersonal skills, social responsibility, self-esteem, gullibility, naïveté (i.e., wariness), follow rules/obeys laws, avoids being victimized, and social problem solving
Practical skills: activities of daily living (personal care), occupational skills, use of money, safety, health care, travel/transportation, schedules/routines, and use of the telephone. (Shalock et al., 2010, p. 44)

These difficulties would be barriers to access to the general curriculum when students with ID are merely exposed to the same activities in the same settings with typically developing peers. Therefore, providing access to the equal setting, without appropriate supports, cannot help students with ID engage in the same opportunities in school.

Collectivism and Individualism. Confucian cultures are categorized as collectivism from the cross-cultural perspective. Collectivism refers to a cultural pattern that prioritizes a group’s goals over individuals’ goals (Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988) as opposed to individualism that values personal goals and autonomy (Y. J. Cho, Mallinckrodt, & Yune, 2010; Triandis, 2001). Uichol Kim (1995), in this sense, described that Confucianism is “one version of collectivism,” and liberalism is “one version of individualism” (p. 41). It would be easy to find a collectivistic trait in Korean Confucianism. As one example, Yi Hwang, a well-known Korean Confucian scholar in the 16th century, contended that pursuing personal things is like a bug corrupting a human mind and the root of all evil (K. Shin, 1995).

Some research revealed that collectivism was dominant in modern South Korea (e.g., H. Park et al., 2005). The South Korean collectivistic culture was influenced by its ethnic homogeneity and socio-political history in addition to Confucianism (Y. Cho & Yoon, 2001; Y. J. Cho, Mallinckrodt, & Yune, 2010; Sunghee Park & Lunt, 2015). There has been an increasing trend in the number of people from different ethnicities, but the majority of residents in South Korea (96.61%) are still ethnically Korean (Korean

Recent research, however, has reported that individualism and collectivism became similarly prevalent in South Korea (E. Chang, 2006; Horak & Yang, 2017; C. Lee, Choi, & Kim, 2018). Y. J. Cho and colleagues stated that the increased prevalence of individualism in South Korea is associated with Westernization of education and business, increased access to Western culture (e.g., trips to western countries, mass media, internet), and increases in jobs that are requiring individual work. Given that individualism involves advocacy for individuals’ rights rather than sacrificing personal interests for groups (G. Han & Shin, 1999), the expansion of individualistic culture in South Korea seems closely relevant to this research. Furthermore, it might be important to consider that urbanization in South Korea led to value changes from harmony and cooperation to “control environment” and “competition” (Young-Shin Park & Kim, 2006, p. 430). This suggests that parents of children with ID might have different values depending on their level of urbanization (e.g., rural village vs. metropolitan city).

Besides, an individual’s disposition is not always consistent with a dominant culture but determined by the degree to which the person accepts a culture (Markus & Kitayama, 1994; Singlis & Brown, 1995). Trandis (2001) specified factors that could influence an individual’s dominant type of disposition (individualism or collectivism). These factors included (a) how an individual defined a self (“reference to social entities”
vs. an independent entity), (b) where an individual bases self-esteem (“getting along” vs. “getting ahead”), and (c) how much an individual internalizes social norms (Trandis, 2001, pp. 913-914). In addition, there have been studies that showed coexistence of individualism and collectivism within an individual (T. H. Kim & Kim, 2017; Markus & Kitayama, 1994; Singelis & Brown, 1995). Horak and Yang (2017) noted that South Korean people could show both individualistic and collectivistic behavior depending on situations.

**Collectivism.** As noted by Triandis and colleagues (1988), people in a collectivistic culture are likely to dedicate themselves for their groups. Y. J, Cho, Mallinckrodt, and Yune (2010) stated that many of them are willing “to put aside personal needs for the good of one’s social group” (p. 82). Cooperation and conformity would be frequently shown in a collectivistic group that has clear social norms (Triandis et al., 1988). Individuals in a collectivistic culture, however, are likely to focus on their own needs and desires when interacting with groups that they do not belong to (outgroup; Triandis et al., 1988). In other words, collectivistic patterns are likely to be apparent only with an ingroup, which is defined as a “group of individuals about whose welfare a person is concerned, with whom that person is willing to cooperate without demanding equitable returns, and separation from whom leads to anxiety” (Triandis, 1995, p. 9).

Triandis and colleagues (1988) assumed theoretically that a collectivistic society might be overall disharmonious because of a rigid boundary of a group and limitations in intergroup collaboration. They stated that people in a collectivistic culture commonly have a few ingroups and leave “everybody else in outgroups” (p. 325). Harmony and stability of ingroups would help these people feel less stress (Triandis, 1988). Thus, they
would prefer conflict resolution that would not destroy ingroup relationships (Triandis, 2001). Regarding conflicts with outgroups, Triandis et al. (1988) recommended “collective coping” (p. 327). This type of advocacy involves organizing or using ingroups to advocate individuals’ rights.

The majority of parents in a collectivistic culture has an interdependent identity with their children (Triandis, 2001). Their parenting would involve “frequent guidance, consultation, socializing with people in the society where the children are included, and penetration into the child's private life” (Triandis et al., 1988). With regard to the socialization of children, parents in a collectivistic culture are likely to emphasize the importance of conformity and obedience, which collectivism values as a means of achieving a group’s goal (Triandis, 2001, p. 912). The study by Im and Sweadener (2016) showed that these collectivistic values might be internalized from early childhood. They examined how young children in South Korea and the US (n = 91) talked about kindergarten experiences. The children in South Korea stated what they have to do in kindergarten (i.e., conformity to school rules) and hardly expressed negative feelings and experiences in school. This was contrasted with the American children whose talk was mostly about what they liked and disliked in school. The collectivistic values including obedience and conformity were known to be positively correlated with trust in professionals (e.g., teachers; Y. J. Cho et al., 2010).

**Individualism.** People in an individualistic culture are mostly independent and autonomous and less likely to sacrifice their interests for a group’s goal (Y. J. Cho et al., 2010; Triandis, 2001). As noted by Triandis and colleagues (1988), they would advocate for their own interests when confronting a conflict of interest with ingroups. If a person in
an individualistic culture is overwhelmed by an ingroup’s demand, s/he will leave the group (Triandis et al., 1988).

Individualism does not have “the sharp difference” between ingroup versus outgroup behavior as does collectivism (Triandis et al. 1988). People who do not belong to an individual’s group are not the same as the outgroup (Triandis et al. 1988). Triandis and colleagues stated that people in an individualistic culture tend to have a large number of ingroups, and they would place “a small portion of their material and emotional security” (p. 324).

**Vertical and horizontal patterns of individualism and collectivism.** Triandis and Gelfand (1998) added vertical and horizontal attributes to collectivism and individualism. They identified that *vertical individualism* (VI) and *vertical collectivism* (VC) commonly emphasize a social hierarchy, whereas *horizontal individualism* (HI) and *horizontal collectivism* (HC) rest on equality of people in social relationships. Individuals in VI are likely to compete with others to “be the best” for themselves (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998, p. 119). Although HI also involves competition between individuals, people in VI would focus on competition more than those in HI would do (Triandis, 2001). An individual in HI would prefer doing his or her “own thing” independent of groups (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998, p. 119).

As noted by Triandis and Gelfand (1998), VC involves prioritizing an ingroup’s goal, power distance between leaders and group members, group members’ submission to leaders, and competition of the ingroup with outgroups. People in VC cultures are likely to feel emotional security in their groups and have interdependence and strong emotional bond with families. These characteristics of VC seems to match Confucian values and
features. Chunsik Lee, Choi, and Kim (2018) reported that participants in VC tended following others’ opinions, particularly authorities’ opinions, for decision-making while those in HC tended to follow their own opinions. Individuals in HC cultures are less likely to submit themselves to authority and to compete against others or other groups (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). They value a group’s goal over person goals and tend to be interdependent (Traindis, 2001). They, however, would not stick to families as much as those in VC cultures (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Cooperation and equality might be the preferred values in these cultures.

**Cultural patterns of generations in South Korea.** Cultural patterns might be inconsistent across generations. One generation would share not only the degree to maturity but a macro-level of experiences (e.g., sociopolitical events or contexts) that are distinct from other generations (Woo-seong Kim, 2012). Sunyoung Park and Park (2018) stated that South Koreans have large cultural gaps between generations because of “rapid industrialization and social transformation” (p. 280). According to them, South Koreans at or over 60 years old (born before 1960) hold VC values. These people experienced military governments (1961-1979) and the success of economic growth under the authoritarian rule. Those in their 50s (born between 1960 and 1969) experienced the civil movement to build up democracy. Although they also hold collectivistic values (Sunyoung Park & Park, 2018), they tend to deny unreasonable submission to authorities and value human equality and the right to freedom (H. Jeong, 2003).

Individualism is displayed by generations that include people at or under their 40s in South Korea (Sunyoung Park & Park, 2018). South Koreans born between 1970 and 1976 spent their youth when South Korea began to protect political freedom and produce
economic prosperity (Sunyoung Park & Park, 2018; H. Jeong, 2003). As noted by Sunyoung Park and Park, this generation has a “strong tendency towards individualism” and values personal achievement (p. 279). Younger generations (people at or under their 30s) are more skilled at speaking up for their rights and tend to pursue liberal and practical values (Sunyoung Park & Park, 2018).

**Literature Review**

I reviewed American and South Korean studies on two topics: (a) parents’ reports on experiences and support needs regarding inclusive education of adolescents with ID, and (b) inclusive education practices for adolescents with ID. Considering the U.S. has influenced legislation and practices for inclusive education in South Korea such as IEPs and parental involvement (M. Han, 2008; Hong, 2006; Y. Kim & Kim, 2008), reviewing both countries’ studies on these topics would contribute to strengthening the basis of this research.

**Parents’ experiences and support needs.** This review examined parents’ experiences and support needs regarding inclusive education for adolescents with ID (i.e., students with ID attending middle or high schools). Specifically, I reviewed research purpose, methods including interview questions, and findings. Peer-reviewed studies were included in this review if they explored parents’ experiences and/or support needs regarding inclusive education in secondary students with ID. I excluded studies that did not collect data from parents such as commentary articles and studies examining teachers’ perceptions on parents’ participation in inclusive education (e.g., M. Lee, Kim, Yang & Noh, 2014).
Search terms were formed in combination of the following key words in each category: (a) parents; (b) intellectual disability, mental retardation, developmental disabilities, severe disabilities, significant disabilities; (c) inclusion, special class. The term special class was used only when searching for South Korean studies because the function of special classes is to support inclusive education according to the ASED. For South Korean studies, I used the South Korean governmental database system (i.e., Research Information Sharing Service; RISS) managed by the South Korean Ministry of Education. This database system provides journal articles that Korean research institutes and conferences have produced or private Korean database systems (i.e., Kyobobook: http://scholar.dkyobobook.co.kr; DBpia: http://dbpia.com; earticle: http://earticle.net; Hakjusa: http://www.newnonmun.com; Korean Studies Information Service System: http://kiss.kstudy.com) retains. For American studies, I used ERIC and PsycInfo using the same search strategy.

**American studies.** The electronic search of American studies returned 794 studies. I identified eight studies from these results after excluding duplicated studies and applying the search criteria and found one additional study by hand search of relevant journals. Table 1 presents a summary of the studies.

**Purpose and Method.** The reviewed studies explored inclusive education perceived by parents of children with disabilities using individual interviews ($n = 6$) and surveys ($n = 3$). These studies examined (a) correlation between parents’ perception on inclusive education and other variables (Palmer, Borthwick-Duffy, & Widaman, 1998); (b) parents’ perceptions on current inclusive education for children with ID including expectation and concerns (Downing & Peckham-Hardin, 2007; Fisher, Pumian, & Sax,
1998; Gallagher et al., 2000; Leyer & Kirk, 2004; Palmer, Borthwick-Duffy, Widaman, & Best, 1998; Ryndak, Downing, Jacqueline, & Morrison, 1995; Ryndak, Downing, Morrison, & William, 1996); and (c) parents’ experiences with inclusive education process (Grove & Fisher, 1999). Five interview studies primarily used face-to-face interviews, but Fisher et al. (1998) used telephone interviews of all participants. Downing and Peckham-Hardin (2007) conducted observation and reviewed artifacts (i.e., student portfolio) to verify interview results reaching triangulation between multiple data collection methods.

Researchers used semi-structured interview questions for the interview studies. The following interview questions were used to explore parents’ initial expectations and/or backgrounds of determining inclusive education for children with ID:

- What did you know about inclusion prior to (your child) attending (his or her school)? (Grove & Fisher, 1999, p. 209)
- “What factors led to the decision to fully include your child?” (Grove & Fisher, 1999, p. 209)

The research questions formed by Grove and Fisher (1999) seemed appropriate to help parents talk about what they expected of inclusive education prior to experiencing it. This may reveal their hopes and desires regarding inclusive education independent of difficulties that they confronted while experiencing inclusive education for their children with ID. The second question, however, might need to be paraphrased because the word *factors* may not be clear or understandable for some people. Gallagher et al. (2000) used
why-question that might lead to broad and/or vague answers (Glesne, 2014; J. Armstrong, personal communication, February 26, 2015).

To examine parents’ experiences with inclusive education for children with ID, researchers asked parents to “describe a typical school day for (child’s name)” (Grove & Fisher, 1999, p. 209) or “describe your child’s educational program since he or she has received special education and related services in inclusive settings” (Ryndak et al., 1996). I think that these questions were appropriate to ask parents’ experiences. To gain more in-depth answers, Ryndak et al. used the following probe questions. These questions seem useful to help parents elaborate their statements.

- Could you explain that for me?
- You mentioned __________: could you be more specific?
- Could you give me an example?
- How did that come about/occur?
- What did that look like? (Ryndak et al., 1996. p. 111).

The following questions were used to examine parents’ perception on benefits of inclusive education.

- Is the student/child successful or not? How do you know? (Downing & Peckham-Hardin, 2007, p. 20)
- What benefits have you seen from (student’s name) participation in these classes? (Fisher et al., 1998, p. 176)
- Think about a specific class that (student’s name) took. What was the best thing that happened? (Fisher et al., 1998, p. 177)
The question employed by Downing and Peckham-Hardin (2007) seems to be a grand tour question that the researchers could find follow-up questions based on what the interviewee said. Downing and Peckham-Hardin actually noted that they asked interviewees for elaboration after the question. Fisher et al.’s (1998) questions would be appropriate as experience questions. Particularly, the third question seems good to yield specific answers by helping parents recall experiences.

Parents’ perception on support needs for inclusive education was investigated with the following questions.

- What is high quality education for students with moderate-severe disabilities? (Downing & Peckham-Hardin, 2007, p. 20)
- What concerns do you have or what are the next steps you would like to see related to general education class participation? (Fisher et al., 1998, p. 177)
- If you could change anything about (student’s name) school program, what would it be? (Fisher et al., 1998, p. 177)

Downing and Peckham-Hardin (2007) found seven components of effective inclusive education using the first question. The question itself, however, seems too broad. It is important to know what strategies they used to draw the in-depth statements from the interviewee’s initial statement, but they did not provide further information. The second question included two questions and seemed to ask the same thing. I think that only asking concerns would be good to understand what supports parents wanted, or asking two questions separately would be better than the double question. The third question created by Fisher et al. (1998) seems appropriate to draw interviewees’ personal
experiences as a hypothetical question. In addition, it seems useful to show parents’ priority of supports that they wanted for inclusive education.

Participating parents presented their hopes and goals of inclusive education following the questions, “What are your hopes as a result of the student being in an inclusive environment?” (Downing & Peckham-Hardin, 2007, p. 20); “What are your educational and social goals for this year?” (Gallapher et al., 2000, p. 139). I think these questions are appropriate to learn parents’ desired outcomes and values associated with inclusive education. As these researchers noted, both questions might require follow-up questions to gain further in-depth statements.

The reviewed studies employing interviews analyzed data using a content analysis process. All of these studies strengthened trustworthiness in several ways. First, these studies included large number of interviewees (range = 13 - 49). Although they interviewed participants only once, they presented triangulation between multiple interviewees to some extent. Downing and Peckham-Hardin (2007) presented a table indicating the number and percentage of interviewees who stated each theme. The remaining four studies (Fisher et al., 1998; Gallapher et al., 2000; Grove & Fisher, 1999; Ryndak et al., 1996) described the number of interviewees who stated each theme under individual interview questions. Second, all of these studies stated that they reached consensus on theming data between coauthors. Third, Downing and Peckham-Hardin (2007) and Gallapher et al. (2000) conducted member checking. Downing and Peckham-Hardin sent interview transcripts to participants by email or mail, and described that they had feedback from 46% of participants and 92% of them agreed with the transcripts. They also stated that they reflected feedback from the remaining 8% of interviewees by
revising transcripts. Gallapher et al. provided participating parents with their draft article and asked them to check categories and themes that they presented based on the parent interviews. They noted that 15 of the 21 parents responded, and they all agreed with the final categories and themes.

Findings. It appears that Downing and Peckham-Hardin (2007) presented overarching findings that embraced the remaining studies’ findings. They interviewed parents of children with moderate to severe disabilities including ID who attended preschool, elementary, or middle schools (n = 9), special education teachers (n = 17), general education teachers (n = 6), and paraprofessionals (n = 17). They then found the following 12 themes associated with a high quality of inclusive education: (a) being with typically developing peers, (b) exposure to everything and high expectations, (c) individualized curricular and instructional supports, (d) skilled and knowledgeable teaching staff, (e) collaboration and teaming, (f) a positive and caring community, (g) providing a balanced educational program education, (h) lead a normal life, and (i) concerns for the future.

Some of these themes were consistently indicated by other reviewed studies. The necessity of ‘skilled and knowledgeable teaching staff’ was repeatedly found by Grove and Fisher (1999), Leyer and Kirk (2004), and Ryndak et al. (1996). Consistent with the theme, ‘a positive and caring community,’ Gallapher et al. (2000) suggested its importance describing that parents felt general education teachers were unwilling to accommodate children with severe disabilities, and Palmer et al. (1998b) indicated that parents were concerned about peer teasing in general education classrooms. Similarly, Leyer and Kirk noted that parents were concerned about social isolation of children with
disabilities and negative attitude toward the children. With regard to ‘exposure to everything and high expectations,’ Ryndak et al. confirmed that parents were not satisfied only with physical integration of children with disabilities in general education classrooms. Gallapher et al. also corroborated that parents wanted children with disabilities to ‘be with typically developing peers’ because peers provide social models.

While all the reviewed studies included parents of children with disabilities at all school ages, Fisher et al. (1998) targeted only parents of high school students with disabilities. They confirmed that parents wanted ‘a balanced educational program education’ between instruction on functional skills and the general education curriculum.

Some researchers reported relevant variables that might influence parents’ perceptions on inclusive education. Leyer and Kirk (2004) noted that parents of younger students with disabilities and those with milder disabilities (i.e., fewer support needs) were more likely to be supportive of inclusive education. This finding, however, seems inconsistent with Ryndak et al. (1995), Palmer et al. (1998a), and Palmer et al. (1998b). Ryndak et al. reported that parents of children with disabilities at all ages showed positive perception on inclusive education. Palmer et al. (1998b) stated that parents of children with significant disabilities perceived that benefits of inclusive education outweigh risks for their children with ID. Palmer et al. (1998a) indicated that parents’ perspectives on inclusive education were influenced by not just one condition but multiple variables such as a child’s characteristics (e.g., intellectual functioning, behavioral issues), the parent’s characteristics (e.g., values on socialization, ethnicity, education), and (c) the child’s placement history.
South Korean studies. The total number of search results was 354, but only three South Korean studies (i.e., J. Shin, 2005; Suk-Hang Lee & Ahn, 2011; W. Lee & Kwak, 2014) met the search criteria. Table 2 shows a summary of the studies.

Purpose and method. J. Shin (2005) and Suk-Hang Lee and Ahn (2011) conducted interview studies with parents, and W. Lee and Kwak (2014) combined the first author’s auto-ethnography with interviews with other parents and special education teachers. J. Shin (2005) examined (a) the reasons that parents of children with ID selected current educational placement (i.e., general education schools or special education schools), (b) parents’ satisfaction and dissatisfaction with education in the current schools, and (c) support needs for their children’s education in that school. J. Shin individually interviewed 25 parents of children with ID who attended general education schools ($n = 15$) or special schools ($n = 13$). This large number of interviews seems good to represent validity of findings based on triangulation between multiple data sources (i.e., interviewers).

J. Shin (2005) conducted a 30 min- to 80 min- interview per participant in the school where the participant’s child attended. This interview setting might be problematic for some parents to talk about something bad about the current school (e.g., dissatisfaction) because they are in the school, and teachers may happen to hear what they are saying. J. Shin described the contents of semi-structured interview questions, but did not show sample questions, and these contents were the same as her research questions. Although interviews seem useful to answer J. Shin’s research questions because she explored the parents’ experiences (Glesne, 2014), it would not be appropriate if she directly asked research questions to the parents (Maxwell, 2012). With regard to
the first research question, she should avoid using a why-question even though she wanted to hear the reasons. This is because why-questions might not be clear to answer and lead to broad and/or vague answers (Glesne, 2014; J. Armstrong, personal communication, February 26, 2015). J. Shin analyzed data employing a content analysis.

Suk-Hang Lee and Ahn (2011) explored inclusive education experiences of secondary students with disabilities and their parents and their support needs. Secondary students refer to those who attend middle schools or high schools in South Korea. They individually interviewed secondary students with disabilities (n = 34) and parents (n = 21). These participants included (a) 24 students with ID who attended general education schools (n = 12) or moved to special schools from general education schools (n = 12) and (b) parents of participant children with ID (n = 12). Suk-Hang Lee and Ahn interviewed parents on the telephone while they conducted face-to-face interview with students.

Suk-Hang Lee and Ahn (2011) created semi-structured interview questions based on their literature review on this topic and pilot interviews with five students with disabilities and a parent. They provided sample questions as below.

- Did you/your children participate in an extracurricular program with typically developing peers?
- What did you like best in a special class?
- Which difficulties did you have in a special class?
- Which supports do you think would be the most important for successful inclusive education?
- What advice would you like to give other parents of children with disabilities who should select education environments?
All of these sample questions appear to be appropriate. The first question is a yes/no question, but it seems to have a probability of producing follow-up questions based on what the interviewee answered. The second and third questions also appear appropriate because they are easy to understand and are asking about interviewees’ experiences. The fourth question seems an ideal position question that Merriam and Tisdell (2015) recommended for evaluating a program. Merriam and Tisdell noted that this type of question is likely to reveal positive and negative aspects of a current program. The last question appears to be a hypothetical question, which Merriam and Tisdell stated as a good question to help interviewees tell personal experiences. Suk-Hang Lee and Ahn analyzed interview data following content analysis procedures using Nvivo8.

W. Lee and Kwak (2014) examined parents’ (a) perceptions on inclusive education members, and (b) changes in their perspectives on inclusive education over time. They interviewed three special education teachers and four parents of children with ID (n = 1) or ASD (n = 3). The individual face-to-face interview was conducted once or twice per participant. W. Lee and Kwak did not specify interview settings or length of time for interviews. In addition to interviews, they used the first author’s journals, pictures, and other artifacts (e.g., IEPs) that she had created and/or kept since her child with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) entered an elementary school. The researchers, however, did not provide information on interview questions. Their data analysis involved content and structural analysis using emotion coding, value coding, and versus coding methods.

Findings. The three studies reported that parents of children with ID reported that their children experienced peer-teasing, parents had difficulties in collaborating with
special and general education teachers, there was a lack of collaboration between special and general education teachers, peers and general education teachers had poor understanding of disabilities (e.g., indifference, overprotection, peer teasing), and there was a lack of educational resources (J. Shin, 2005; Suk-Hang Lee & Ahn, 2011; W. Lee & Kwak, 2014). With regard to support needs for inclusive education, J. Shin (2005) and Suk-Hang Lee and Ahn (2011) commonly stated that parents desired (a) collaboration between general and special education teachers, (b) improvement of general education teachers’ understanding of teaching children with disabilities, and (c) provision of therapeutic or extracurricular programs. Suk-Hang Lee and Ahn additionally noted that parents reported lack of supports such as learning supports in inclusive classes (e.g., peer tutor, paraprofessional/ special education teacher support), support for peer relationships, and vocational training.

**Inclusive education practices for adolescents with ID in the US.** The primary goal of this review was to summarize research-validated inclusive education practices for middle and/or high school students with ID. These practices would contribute to facilitating inclusive education and preventing movement of students with disabilities to restrictive settings. According to the IDEA, inclusive education practices function as supplemental aids and services that would help adolescents with ID make progress in the LRE (20 U.S.C. § 1414 (d) (1) (A) (i) (IV)). The IDEA also permits that students with disabilities could be placed in more restrictive settings if they could not accomplish further learning with the practices (20 U.S.C. § 1412 (a) (5); CFR 300 § 114 (a)).

Although there have been some reviews of research examining inclusive education practices for adolescents with ID, they were published about 10 years ago and
limited to particular outcomes such as communication (e.g., Downing, 2005) and social interaction (e.g., Carter & Hughes, 2005). Furthermore, recent reviews exploring inclusive education practices did not specifically focus on secondary school students. Copeland and Cosbey (2010) reviewed studies that implemented interventions to improve access to the general curriculum for students with extensive support needs. Alquraini and Gut (2012) focused on studies involving inclusive education practices for students with severe disabilities. Hudson, Browder, and Wood (2013) evaluated quality of studies that explored the effects of inclusive education practices on academic achievement of students with ID.

My research questions included:

(a) What are the research-validated practices for adolescents with ID educated in general education classes?

(b) What were the characteristics of the practices in research (e.g., intervention agents, contexts, required strategies, outcomes)?

**Method.** I searched for studies examining inclusive education practices for adolescents with ID in five databases (i.e., ERIC, PsycInfo, Education Research Complete, Academic Search Complete, Academic Search Premier) using keywords for the disability category, school levels, and inclusive practices as follows: (a) disability: *intellectual disabilit*, *mental* *retard*, *severe disabilities*, *significant disabilities*; (b) school level: *middle school*, *high school*, *college*, *secondary*, *postsecondary*, *post-secondary*; (c) practice: *inclusion*, *inclusive practice*, *inclusive education*, *general education*, *general curriculum*, *behavior*, *problem behavior*. Then, I reviewed references of the studies that I identified with this electronic search.
Peer-reviewed research was included in this review if it (a) was conducted in the U.S., (b) included at least one student with ID educated in a middle or high school; and (c) attempted to demonstrate the effects of an inclusive education practices (i.e., experimental study). Studies were excluded if they (a) provided only descriptions of existing inclusive practices or models with no results of their implementation of the practices; (b) used a broad category of disabilities that may or may not include ID (e.g., cognitive, multiple, profound, severe, or developmental disabilities); or (c) were quasi-experimental studies.

I classified inclusive education practices (i.e., independent variable in each study) based on (a) instruction models if the practice followed a particular instruction model and (b) components of the practices (e.g., self-management strategies) if the practice did not apply a particular model. Then, I coded participants’ characteristics (e.g., school levels, disabilities), contexts (e.g., lunch time, transition, particular subject classes), intervention agents’ required trainings and skills, external supports (e.g., curricular or instructional adaptation, coaching), and outcomes (e.g., peer interactions, class engagement, academic achievement). I also analyzed variations of procedures for a particular instruction model.

**Results.** I identified 36 studies from the electronic search \( n = 26 \) and hand search of relevant journals \( n = 10 \) as seen in Table 3. This review indicated seven types of inclusive education practices for adolescents with ID as follow: (a) peer support arrangements \( n = 10 \), (b) embedded instruction \( n = 9 \), (c) inquiry lesson \( n = 2 \), (d) self-determined learning model of instruction (SDLMI; \( n = 3 \)), (e) self-management strategies \( n = 7 \), (f) cooperative learning \( n = 1 \), and (g) peer-mediated social supports \( n = 4 \). Researchers conducted each of these inclusive practices for middle school
students with ID, and yet did not implement the SDLMI, cooperative learning and inquiry lesson for high school students with ID. Table 4 presents participants, inclusive contexts, intervention agents, and outcomes of each practice as indicated by reviewed studies. Table 5 presents a summary of procedures for the inclusive education practices.

**Peer support arrangements.** Peer support arrangements involved the following procedures: (a) selecting peer partners, (b) training peer partners and facilitators (e.g., special education teachers, paraprofessionals), (c) peer partners’ support in class, and (d) facilitators’ ongoing monitors and supports for peer partners (Carter & Kennedy, 2006; Gaylord-Ross & Pitts-Conway, 1984). Teachers nominated peer partners who they expected to support a focus student (i.e., a student with ID) well (Biggs et al., 2017; Brock, Biggs, Carter, Cattey, & Raley, 2016; Carter et al., 2016; Carter, Moss, Hoffman, Chung, & Sisco, 2011; Carter, Sisco, Melekoglu, & Kurkowski, 2007; Y. C. Chung & Carter, 2013). Researchers recommended selecting peer partners who were (a) enrolled in the same class as the focus student, (b) willing to support the student, and (c) previously had a positive relationship with the student. In addition, it has been preferred and recommended that a focus student have two or three peer partners rather than only one (Brock et al., 2016; Brock & Carter, 2016; Carter et al., 2011; Carter et al., 2016; Y. C. Chung & Carter, 2013).

Biggs, Carter, and Gustafson (2017) added a collaborative planning procedure before training peer partners. They formed a collaborative team that consisted of a focus student, two peer partners, and educational team members (i.e., a paraprofessional, a special education teacher, a general education teacher of target class subjects, speech language pathologist if related to the focus student’s educational needs). The educational
team created an individualized peer support plan that included support goals and specific responsibilities of the collaborative team members and then shared it with student members.

Peer partners generally provided a student with ID with academic and/or social supports. The academic supports embodied curricular adaptation (e.g., selecting a IEP goal related to an ongoing class activity; Kennedy et al., 1997) and instructional support (e.g., paraphrasing a question; Carter, Cushing, Clark, & Kennedy, 2005; Carter et al., 2011). The social supports included prompting a focus student to use his/her alternative augmentative communication (AAC) device (e.g., Proloquo2Go) and creating communication opportunities for the focus student (Biggs et al., 2017; Y. C. Chung & Carter, 2013).

Three studies involved peer partner trainings in the presence of the paired student with ID during ongoing classes (Carter et al., 2005; Kennedy et al., 1997; Shukla et al., 1998), but more recent studies conducted initial trainings for the partners at separate times and places from the focus student (Brock & Carter, 2016; Brock et al., 2016; Carter et al., 2007; Carter et al., 2011; Carter et al., 2016; Y. C. Chung & Carter, 2013). These trainings commonly consisted of describing (a) an overview of research and the rationale of peer support, (b) background information about focus students (e.g., preferred communication modes, interests), (c) focus students’ goals and expected behaviors in classrooms, and (d) how to support the students in different class activities and encourage them to participate in class. Brock et al. (2016) refined the list of peer training topics (Carter et al., 2009) by adding instructions on peer partners’ ethical code (i.e., confidentiality, respectfulness) and when to recruit adult facilitators’ assistance.
Adult facilitators (e.g., special education teachers, paraprofessionals) provided monitoring and feedback to peer partners while staying in class. Some researchers asked facilitators to implement an initial peer training as well (Biggs et al., 2017; Brock & Carter, 2016; Brock et al., 2016). With regard to facilitator trainings, earlier studies (e.g., Kennedy et al., 1997; Shukla et al., 1998) did not specify procedures for the trainings though they explicitly described adult facilitation in class (e.g., monitoring every 10 min, providing feedback at the end of the class). More recent studies provided systematic procedures for facilitator trainings. Facilitators were trained in using peer support strategies (e.g., assignment adaptation) and facilitative strategies (e.g., monitoring, prompting, delivering feedbacks and reinforcement (Biggs et al., 2017; Carter et al., 2005; Carter et al., 2007; Y. C. Chung & Carter, 2013). Carter et al. (2005) used competency-based trainings for facilitators (e.g., trainings until a facilitator’s performance fidelity reached 100% for three consecutive days). Some researchers provided a checklist for monitoring peer partners’ support behavior for facilitators and/or provided coaching in class after facilitator trainings (Carter et al., 2005; Carter et al., 2011; Carter et al., 2016; Y. C. Chung & Carter, 2015).

Peer support arrangements have been reported to be effective in improving peer interactions, increasing class engagement, and acquiring academic content for adolescents with ID (Brock et al., 2016; Carter et al., 2016). All of the reviewed studies using peer support arrangements consistently showed increases in frequency of peer interactions of students with ID. Carter et al. (2007, 2011) noted that some participants with ID extended social interactions to other classmates who were not directly involved in peer support. Furthermore, Carter et al. (2007) reported that the interactions between
students with ID and typically developing peers were reciprocal rather than peer-dominated. Kennedy et al. (1997) and Carter et al. (2016) showed that students with ID perceived more peers as their friends following peer support arrangements. Researchers also identified that interaction topics were balanced between task- and social-related ones (Carter et al., 2007; Carter et al., 2011), or task-related topics were somewhat more frequently used (Carter et al., 2016).

Most of the studies examining peer support arrangements included measuring class participation of students with ID, but the results were inconsistent across the studies. Some researchers showed that peer support arrangements increased the frequency that students with ID engaged in ongoing academic class activities (Carter et al., 2016; Shukla et al., 1998). Others reported no significant change in academic engagement of students with ID because data on the academic engagement were highly variable within each case (Brock & Carter, 2016; Carter et al., 2007; Carter et al., 2011). Carter and Chung (2013) noted that their intervention did not disrupt the academic activities of students with ID because of no change in the academic engagement during intervention phases. Although Biggs et al. (2017) included academic support in peer partners’ responsibility, there were only slight increases in academic engagement of students with ID following the intervention.

Some students with ID showed improvements of individualized academic and social goal behaviors during peer support arrangements. Brock et al. (2016) reported that three of four participant students with disabilities (i.e., ID, ASD) improved goal behaviors associated with their IEPs such as typing and task-completion. In the study by Carter et al. (2015), teachers reported significantly higher progress on social goal
behaviors of students with disabilities in a peer support group than those in a comparison group, but no significant difference in academic goal behaviors between the groups.

*Embedded instruction.* The embedded instruction involved (a) determining target skills and/or contents, (b) conducting a pretest to select targets for intervention trials (e.g., target words) that students need to know excluding what they already know, (c) training instructors (e.g., paraprofessionals, peer tutors), (d) delivering systematic instruction while distributing trials throughout an ongoing class, and (e) conducting daily or weekly testing probes. Target skills were relevant to what peers were currently learning in the class. For example, McDonnell et al. (2002) set a target skill for students with ID in foods and nutrition class as identifying 15 words and symbols out of vocabulary words that peers were required to read and spell and used frequently in that class. Target skills were either discrete (e.g., reading or defining a word, identifying a symbol) or chained (e.g., searching for an unfamiliar word in a sentence in a web dictionary, solving a math question using a calculator; Heinrich et al., 2016; Jameson et al., 2007).

A researcher or a special education teacher determined target words or skills to which participants did not respond correctly in a pre-test session. This session occurred in a special education classroom and was identical to probe session conditions. When target skills are relevant to vocabulary words or symbols, researchers made a card that showed each word and symbol by putting a typed word or symbol on a 3*5 index card (i.e., flash cards; Collins et al., 2007; Heinrich et al., 2016; Jameson et al., 2007; Jimenez et al., 2012; McDonnell et al., 2002; Risen et al., 2003).

Researchers trained instructors (e.g., a special education teacher, a paraprofessional, a peer tutor, a general education teacher) in implementing procedures
for embedded instruction using modeling, role-play, and feedback (Heinrich et al., 2016; Jameson et al., 2007, 2012; Jameson et al., 2012; McDonnell et al., 2002; Risen et al., 2003). Instructor trainings took 30 min to an hour. Heinrich et al., Jameson et al. (2007, 2012) and Risen et al. used competency-based trainings (e.g., training until instructors demonstrated every step of embedded instruction with 100% accuracy for two consecutive sessions). Some researchers offered instructors scripts or checklists to maintain high procedural fidelity (Jameson et al., 2007, 2012; Jimenez et al., 2012; McDonnell et al., 2002; Risen et al., 2003). Even after instructor trainings, Risen et al. and McDonnell et al. observed instructors’ (i.e., paraprofessionals) performances and delivered feedback in class until the paraprofessionals implemented the embedded instruction with 100% accuracy for two consecutive sessions. Jimenez et al. (2012) combined the embedded instruction with peer support arrangements that Carter and Kennedy (2006) described. Thus, peer partners received ongoing adult-delivered monitoring while implementing the embedded instruction.

Once instructors received trainings, they implemented each step of embedded instruction as follows: (a) verbal direction, (b) time delay, (c) verbal praise contingent on a student’s correct response, and (d) error correction followed by no or an incorrect response (McDonnell, Johnson, Polychronis, & Risen, 2002). They were responsible for presenting instructional trials whenever they found appropriate time throughout ongoing class activities (e.g., roll call, break or transition between activities), but at least three times during a class period. Heinrich et al. (2016) did not allow instructors to run a trial during a general education teacher’s lecture to lessen disruptions. When instructors initiated a trial for students with disabilities, they delivered a verbal direction (e.g., “read
the words”; McDonnell et al., 2002, p. 369) while showing a flash card or pointing at a target word on a worksheet. Heinrich et al. used an attentional cue (e.g., “Are you ready to begin working on math?”; p. 46) before giving the verbal direction to participants.

Next, instructors provided either constant or simultaneous time delay. Some researchers used constant time delay that involved three- or five-second time delay after learners reached a performance criterion (e.g., 100% accuracy over two consecutive sessions) with zero-second time delay (Jameson et al., 2007, 2012; McDonnell et al., 2002; Jimenez et al., 2012). Specifically, instructors first showed a model as soon as they presented a verbal direction (e.g., “This word is colander, say colander”; MacDonnell et al., 2002, p. 369). Then, they delivered (a) verbal praise if a student with disabilities imitated models correctly, or (b) error correction if the student exhibited no or incorrect responses. Error correction procedures consisted of (a) saying “no”; (b) modeling the correct response; and (c) providing verbal praise contingent on the student’s correct response. Once a student with disabilities met a performance criterion, instructors extended the amount of delay time as researchers predetermined (i.e., three- or five-second time delay). This allowed students with disabilities to have opportunities to show their target skills by themselves without prompts.

Other researchers employed simultaneous time delay (Collins, Evans, Creech-Galloway, Karl, & Miller, 2007; Heinrich et al., 2016; Risen et al., 2003). This strategy is the same as zero-second time delay that involved modeling right after a discriminative stimulus. Verbal praise and error correction were delivered depending on students’ responses as embedded instruction with constant time. Instructors using simultaneous time delay, however, did not extend the time between a verbal direction and modeling...
after learners reached performance criteria. Instead, they excluded the target skill in the next trials if students demonstrated it as described in the criteria.

Smith et al. (2013) used computer-assisted embedded instruction. They developed PowerPoint slides that included a question, a photograph, and multiple choices per a slide. The slides also provided voices reading all texts. Following the voices, learners had five seconds to answer the question. If they selected a correct answer, the program highlighted the answer and allowed them to turn to the next page. When students selected an incorrect answer or did not respond for five seconds, they faced error correction procedures. Specifically, the program highlighted the correct answer (i.e., modeling) and enabled the students to touch the highlighted answer (i.e., imitation) in order to progress to the next slide. When the program was messed up for some reasons (e.g., students’ rush), peers reset the slideshow. During this computer-assisted embedded instruction, students with disabilities received intermittent feedback from adults (e.g., researcher, general education teacher) or peers.

Some studies showed consistently positive effects of the embedded instruction in generalization contexts. Risen et al. (2003) and Smith et al. (2013) allowed students with disabilities to read or define target words on worksheets that general education teachers provided for all students in class rather than flash cards that paraprofessionals used for the students with disabilities during a training phase. Heinrich et al. (2016) used real objects for generalization of identifying geometric figures that a student with ID acquired during trainings using index cards. Jimenez et al. (2012) asked instructors (i.e., peers) to present picture symbols similar to but simpler than the symbols that participants used during embedded instruction.
Studies examining embedded instruction commonly showed positive effects on acquisition of skills for students with ID. These effects were consistent for both discrete skills and chained skills. Seven studies targeted discrete skills (e.g., reading or defining key words, identifying figures) and showed that students with ID mastered the skills following embedded instruction (Collins et al., 2007; Jameson et al., 2007, 2012; McDonnell et al., 2002; Risen et al., 2003; Smith et al., 2013). Jameson et al. (2012) assigned chained skills (e.g., searching for an unfamiliar word in the web dictionary) to two middle and one high school students with disabilities while they aimed at a discrete skill for a child enrolled in elementary school. The results indicated that all of the participants met a predetermined performance criterion (i.e., 100% accuracy over two consecutive probes). In the study by Heinrich et al. (2016), three high school students with ID acquired instructional sets consisting of a discrete skill (e.g., identifying vocabulary words in biology class, identifying geometric symbols) and a chained skill (e.g., web search, solving a math problem) via embedded instruction with simultaneous prompts. These skills were relevant to academic classes (e.g., math, biology, computer).

In addition, Collins et al. (1999, 2007) revealed that embedded instruction was consistently effective for high school students with ID to master the target skills that were either directly related or unrelated to ongoing classes. Collins et al. (1999) enabled a general education teacher (i.e., English teacher) to present two units of target knowledge including punctuation (i.e., related skill to the class) and city of governors (i.e., unrelated to the class) in English classes. Following the embedded instruction, all the participants demonstrated acquisition of both kinds of knowledge. Similarly, Collins et al. (2007) delivered embedded instruction using an instructional set containing (a) an academic
sight word that was frequently used in class (e.g., U.S history unit), and (b) a functional sight word that met individual students’ IEP goals (e.g., job application words). All middle and high school students who participated in this study \((n = 3)\) demonstrated 100% accuracy of identifying both sight words and maintained it for three months.

Different instructors (e.g., special education teacher, paraprofessional, peer) indicated consistent implementation of embedded instruction during ongoing general education classes. Paraprofessionals and special education teachers conducted the instruction with high procedural fidelity in general education classrooms (Collins et al., 2007; Jameson et al., 2007, 2012; McDonnell et al., 2002; Risen et al., 2003). Typically developing peers were able to implement the instruction consistently as well (Heinrich et al., Jimenez et al., 2012). According to Jimenez et al., peer-mediated instruction also benefitted participant peers. Following the intervention, none of them \((n = 6)\) fell down in their average grade of the class (i.e., science) in which they delivered embedded instruction for students with disabilities. Rather, two of them showed a higher letter-grade in science.

Embedded instruction consistently led to positive effects on skill acquisition no matter what prompt strategy an instructor used between simultaneous and constant time delay. Four studies involved constant time delay (Jameson et al., 2007, 2012; Jimenez et al., 2012; McDonnell et al., 2002), and two studies employed simultaneous time delay (Collins et al., 2007; Heinrich et al., 2016). These studies all indicated positive effects of embedded instruction on skill acquisition. Furthermore, Risen et al. (2003) examined relative efficacy of embedded instruction with simultaneous time delay and with constant
time delay. Their results were mixed while representing different efficacy of these two methods depending on participants.

The positive effects of embedded instruction were not significantly different from the effects of massed instruction in a special education (Collins et al., 2007; Jameson et al., 2007, 2012). Specifically, students with disabilities reached a mastery level of target skills whether an instructor (a) distributed individual trials throughout a class in a general education classroom, or (b) presented them all together in a row in a special education classroom. Some participants attained a mastery criterion with massed instruction faster than with embedded instruction, another reached the criterion more quickly via embedded instruction, and the others showed the exact same number of trials to acquire target skills in embedded and massed instruction. Even within one study, these results were varied. While the effects of these two interventions were not significantly different on skill acquisition, general and special education teachers and paraprofessionals perceived that embedded instruction promoted participation of students with disabilities in general education class more than massed instruction (Jameson et al., 2012).

Inquiry lesson. Two studies implemented the inquiry lesson for six middle school students with ID (Jimenez, Browder, & Courtade, 2010; Wood, Browder, & Flynn, 2015). The participants received one-to-one trainings in a special education classroom and then generalized target skills in a general education classroom. Jimenez et al. (2010) used general education science classes for the generalization. Wood et al. (2015) did not describe a specific subject of general education classes, but their learning materials were relevant to social studies.
The procedures for the inquiry lesson were more likely teacher-directed. Jimenez et al. (2010) and Wood et al. (2015) spent the majority of research sessions in special education classrooms for one-to-one trainings and a few sessions (range = 1-4 sessions) in general education classrooms for generalization. Jimenez et al. targeted self-directed learning of two science terms using (a) researcher-created science story books that included visual prompts and texts regarding two science concepts, and (b) “KWHL (what we know, want to know, how to find out, what we learned) work book” (p. 35). During the one-to-one trainings, Jimenez et al. implemented constant time delay, modeling, and praise for independent correct responses. Wood et al. asked special education teachers to train students with ID in generating and answering questions using an adapted textbook after they trained the teachers. The special education teachers delivered least intrusive prompts to help students with ID generate and answer questions in relation to adapted textbooks.

The results of both studies were positive. Jimenez et al. (2010) showed increases in independent work (i.e., self-directed learning), and Wood et al. (2015) reported improvement in self-questioning of students with ID. This progress was maintained in general education classes (i.e., science, social studies, respectively). The inclusive science class in the study by Jimenez was based on inquiry lesson format and co-teaching with special education and general education science teachers. Wood et al., however, brought an inquiry lesson format to a general education classroom to examine generalization of target skills of students with ID.

**SDLMI.** The SDLMI was developed by Mithaug, Wehmeyer, Agran, Martin, and Palmer in 1998 to help young adults “become causal agents in their lives” (Wehmeyer,
Palmer, Agran, Mithaug, & Martin, 2000, p. 440). This model consists of four questions in each of three phases so that students with disabilities (a) set a goal, (b) make a plan to achieve it, and (c) evaluate the goal behavior (Agran et al., 2008).

The first phase involved answering four questions as follow: (a) “what do I want to learn?”; (b) “what do I know about it now?”; (c) “what must change for me to learn what I don’t know?”; (d) “what can I do to make this happen?” (Agran, Wehmeyer, Cavin, & Palmer, 2010, p. 168). Teachers helped students with ID narrow down potential goals by discussing some behaviors relevant to IEPs, letting them select three behaviors that they wanted to change most, and then having them choose one of them (Agran, Blanchard, Wehmeyer, & Hughes, 2002). Agran, Cavin, Wehmeyer, and Palmer (2006) and Agran et al. (2010) provided individualized goal choices for each participant. These choices were aligned with the school districts’ standards. Agran et al. (2006) presented these choices in a manner of matching each participant’s preferences for communication modes. For example, they presented pictures displaying each goal choice and had a student with ID point at what they wanted.

The second phase of SDLMI is the process of planning to achieve goals with the following questions: (a) “what can I do to learn what I don’t know?”; (b) “what could keep me from taking action?”; (c) “what can I do to remove the barriers?”; (d) “do I know what I want to know?” (Agran et al., 2006, p. 235). Agran et al. (2002) asked participants to read each question aloud, verbalize potential answers, and repetitively read the questions loudly until they were convinced that the participants were able to use the questions for themselves. Then, the participants applied the four questions in sequence at every beginning of class. If needed, they used cue cards to recall the questions.
Agran et al. (2006) and Agran et al., (2010) asked participants to select self-management strategies that they wanted to use for their goals in this phase. Students with ID selected self-monitoring, self-monitoring with self-instruction (Agran et al., 2006), self-prompting (i.e., antecedent cue regulation), or self-instruction (Agran et al., 2010). Following the selection, participants were trained in using the strategies via modeling, verbal descriptions of examples and non-examples, and opportunities for practices. Then they used those strategies in class for their self-selected goals. All three studies involved praise and corrective feedback until the students reached the performance criterion (i.e., 80% correct responses of given opportunities for three or eight consecutive sessions).

The last phase of SDLMI involved completing the next four questions: (a) “what actions have I taken?”; (b) “what barriers have been removed?”; (c) “what has changed about what I don’t know?”; (d) “do I know what I want to know?” (Agran et al., 2010, p. 168). Researchers used this phase as social validation during a maintenance condition (Agran et al., 2002, 2006, 2010). The majority of participants including students with ID perceived that they achieved their goals following the intervention. Four students with ID (n = 2) and with other disabilities (n = 2) reported that they felt more comfortable, had more fun, made more friends in general education classes as they removed barriers to their goal behaviors (Agran et al., 2002). Most of the participants considered that using student-directed strategies were effective in removing barriers to their goals (Agran et al., 2002, 2006, 2010).

All of the three studies consistently reported that students with ID improved and maintained their goal behaviors even after withholding corrective feedback and reinforcement. The goal behaviors included class participation (e.g., following directions,
answering questions: $n = 8$; Agran et al., 2002; Agran et al., 2006; Agran et al., 2010), behaviors specific to academic content (e.g., identification of different types of maps in science class: $n = 3$; Agran et al., 2006; Agran et al., 2010), and social skills (e.g., appropriate touching, speaking: $n = 2$; Agran et al., 2002).

Self-management strategies. Researchers employed a single self-management skill such as self-monitoring only (Hughes, Agran, Copeland, et al., 2002; Gilbert, Agran, Hughes, & Wehmeyer, 2004) and self-prompting only (Hughes et al., 2004; Hughes et al., 2011; Hughes et al., 2013) or combined multiple strategies as follows: (a) goal setting, self-monitoring, self-prompting, and self-evaluation (Copeland, Hughes, Agran, Wehmeyer, & Fowler, 2002; Hughes et al., 2004); (b) self-prompting, self-monitoring, self-evaluation, and self-reinforcement (Wehmeyer, Yeager, Bolding, Agran, & Hughes, 2003).

Three studies targeted student-selected goal behaviors. Copeland et al. (2002) helped high school students with ID set a goal by (a) explaining a definition of a goal, (b) showing scores that the students gained in cosmetology classes during baseline conditions, and then (c) asking them to set a goal relevant to letter grades that they wanted (e.g., A, B). Hughes et al. (2004) used yes or no questions to identify goals of middle school students with ID concerning recreational activities in physical education classes. Wehmeyer et al. (2003) allowed middle school students with ID ($n = 2$) and with ASD ($n = 1$) to select their goals to be successful in general education classrooms and also considered the results of direct observation about the students’ performance in inclusive settings in cooperation with special education teachers.
These researchers paired goal setting with self-evaluation strategies. Similar to goal-setting procedures, they supported self-evaluation of students with disabilities. Copeland et al. (2002) reminded participant students of their goal behaviors and trained them in performing two steps of self-evaluation using modeling and verbal prompts. Hughes et al. (2004) (a) verbally asked whether participants completed individual steps of goal behavior \( n = 3 \) or not, (b) recorded their answers on a recording sheet, and (c) computed and recorded the number of completed steps on the sheet. Then, the researchers enabled each participant to determine goal attainment based on the written number. Wehmeyer et al. (2003) allowed students with disabilities to evaluate goal behaviors based on their self-monitoring data after comparing the data with adults’ monitoring data (e.g., an observer’s recording data). Following goal attainment, these students obtained a self-identified reinforcer (e.g., computer time in class, school supply).

Four studies included self-monitoring strategies. Researchers commonly created a self-monitoring sheet containing descriptions of specific behaviors and blanks or check boxes for participants to record occurrences or non-occurrences of target behavior (Copeland et al., 2002; Gilbert et al., 2004; Hughes et al., 2004; Wehmeyer et al., 2003). Hughes, Agran, et al. (2002), however, did not include self-recording in self-monitoring procedures for three participants but one. They employed Agran’s definition (1997) that included self-observation of target behavior and discrimination of when to engage in the behavior. Specifically, the participants were trained in using visual prompts such as a picture card displaying a target behavior (e.g., a drawing of a person with the words “head up” and “eye contact”) or looking at an item (i.e., money given by customer students) that prompted the participant to emit a target response (i.e., saying “thank you”
to customer). As noted by Hughes, Agran, et al., this is similar to the self-prompting strategy used by Copeland et al., Hughes et al. (2004), Jimenez et al. (2010), and Wehmeyer et al. (2003).

Gilberts et al. (2001) implemented peer-mediated self-monitoring strategies to improve classroom behaviors of students with ID (e.g., in-seat, asking questions, greeting a teacher). Following peer trainings, peers were paired with students with ID. These peer tutors taught students an overview of self-monitoring, examples and non-examples, and use of a self-recording sheet. This training occurred for 10 to 15 min at the end of class when other students were doing independent seatwork. Once the peer tutors completed the initial training, they delivered prompts, praise, and feedback for self-monitoring and target behavior (i.e., classroom survival skills) during the same time period until the students with ID performed self-monitoring with 100% accuracy for three consecutive sessions. Then the peer tutors withheld these strategies. The peer tutors, however, redelivered these strategies when the target behavior of the students with ID occurred 80% or below over two consecutive sessions. This retraining continued until the students with ID performed self-recording with 100% accuracy for two consecutive sessions.

Four studies examined the effects of self-prompting on academic or social engagement of adolescents with ID. Three studies used supplementary materials (e.g., picture books, communication books) to prompt social engagement of high school students with ID (Hughes et al., 2004; Hughes et al., 2011; Hughes et al., 2013). These studies commonly involved (a) providing materials designed for using self-prompting strategies for communication, (b) recruiting peer partners, (c) delivering one-to-one trainings for students with ID, and (d) providing interactive contexts while withdrawing
the training strategies. Copeland et al. (2002) provided modified worksheets for task completion of high school students with ID. These worksheets addressed the same academic contents as a general education class (i.e., cosmetology) textbook, but had a smaller number of questions, key words for answering the questions, and written prompts showing procedures for task completion step by step. The participants with ID got trained in completing the worksheets using the key word hints and written prompts via a trainer’s “direct instruction, modeling, guided practice, praise, and corrective feedback” (Copeland et al., 2002, p. 37).

Researchers showed that self-management strategies were associated with improvements of adolescents with ID in (a) engagement in general education classes, (b) social interactions, and (c) academic achievement. Copeland et al. (2002) reported that high school students with ID improved their independent task completion in general education cosmetology classes following an intervention package (i.e., task adaptation, instruction in task completion, students’ goal setting, instruction in self-monitoring and self-evaluation). They highlighted that task adaptation alone was not effective in improving the students’ task completion. Its combination with instruction in completing tasks (i.e., direct instruction, modeling, guided practice, praise, and corrective feedback) and self-directed strategies led to the positive effects. All of the students and their cosmetology teacher were satisfied with the intervention procedures and perceived that the participants improved their task completion following the intervention.

Hughes et al. (2004) showed the positive effects of their intervention package including goal-setting, self-prompting (i.e., use of researcher-created picture book to initiate recreational activities), and goal-evaluation on engagement of participants with
ID in typical activities in physical education classes. The quality of the participants’ interaction increased. All of these positive outcomes were maintained after withdrawing adult assistance (e.g., prompt, feedback). Peer activity partners for the intervention stated that interactions with the students with ID were highly appropriate, and they enjoyed the interactions.

Hughes et al. (2011) and Hughes et al. (2013) examining the effects of using a communication book reported (a) increases in frequency of peer interactions, (b) high quality of the interactions, and (b) wide ranges of different topics during the interactions (e.g., school, non-school events, families). Quality of interaction indicated that students with ID contributed to a conversation equally to or more than peer partners (Hughes et al., 2011; Hughes et al., 2013). Hughes et al. (2013) noted that the increased interactions lasted up to 8 months following the intervention. Participants with ID perceived that they made more friends (Hughes et al., 2011; Hughes et al., 2013) following the intervention, and communication books were helpful to make a friend (Hughes et al., 2013).

In the study by Hughes, Agran, Copeland, et al. (2002), all three participants’ target behaviors including academic achievement (i.e., identification of auto mechanic tools) and social skills (i.e., head up during interactions with others, saying “thank you” to customers during cookie sales in school, conversation initiation) significantly increased following the trainings. This was maintained after withholding adult supports (e.g., prompt, praise, feedback).

Gilberts et al. (2001) reported that peer-delivered trainings in self-monitoring for students with ID were effective in improving the students’ classroom behaviors as well as the accuracy of self-monitoring. Wehmeyer et al. (2003) demonstrated the positive
effects of an intervention package incorporating self-prompting or self-monitoring with self-evaluation and self-reinforcement on student-selected goal behaviors (i.e., on-task behavior, social skills, inappropriate touching, disruptive behavior). These behaviors were maintained after withdrawing adult supports. The researchers reported that trainings using prompts, role-play, and corrective feedback were effective for students with disabilities to master the self-management strategies. These students reached mastery criterion (i.e., 100% accuracy for three consecutive sessions) within three to seven sessions.

Cooperative Learning. Cushing, Kennedy, Shukla, Davis, and Meyer (1997) implemented cooperative learning for two middle school students in English classes. One of the participants had ID. Cushing et al. delineated characteristics of cooperative learning as (a) dividing class students into small groups, (b) providing adapted class materials, and (c) instructing group members with each other under a teacher’s supervision. I describe their specific procedures as below.

First, a general education English teacher established small groups consisting of three to five students who had different levels of academic achievement (e.g., high, average, low). Participants with disabilities were grouped with volunteer peers. Then, the teacher introduced four different roles to students including: (a) a material manager (i.e., receiving, distributing, collecting, and returning class item packages for all members), (b) a recorder who read each question aloud and wrote down members’ answers on a worksheet, (c) a checker who filled in a group checklist, and (d) organizer who supervised other members’ role performances and on-task behavior. Second, the English teacher trained students in performing all four roles during two class periods. Each
student, including a student with ID, played any of the roles because their roles were rotated. The overall class consisted of (a) the teacher’s lecture for 10 min, (b) distribution of class materials (e.g., key word cards, fact cards, team activity worksheets), (c) reciprocal peer tutoring using key word cards for 8 minutes, (d) reciprocal peer tutoring using fact cards, (e) team activity using worksheets for 5 minutes, and (f) group-based wrap-up.

Cushing et al. (1997) compared the effects of cooperative learning and peer support arrangements with the same adapted class materials. The results indicated that the participants with and without disabilities showed greater increases in engagement in class activities during cooperative learning than peer support arrangements. Academic achievement of the participants without disabilities were greater in peer support arrangements than cooperative learning conditions. The participants with disabilities exhibited more social engagement during peer support arrangements. The peers without disabilities and the English teacher preferred cooperative learning to peer support arrangements.

**Peer-mediated social supports.** Some studies involved peers in inclusive practices for adolescents with ID without employing a particular model (e.g., peer support arrangements, embedded instruction, SDLMI). Schaefer and Armentrout (2002) studied the effects of peer buddies on initiation of peer interactions of a middle school student with Down syndrome in life management classes. Their intervention consisted of peer trainings and pairing the trained peer buddies with the participant with ID. Four of the class students volunteered to be a peer buddy and received trainings in understanding Down syndrome, using person-first language, and supporting students with disabilities.
The results indicated that the student with ID showed higher levels of social initiation frequency during the intervention phase and generalized the outcomes in a different place.

Hughes, Copeland, Wehmeyer, et al. (2002) delivered a simple verbal direction, asking peers to spend time with a student with disabilities, for five students with disabilities including students with ID ($n = 1$) and with ID and language impairment ($n = 2$). Prior to the directive, the researchers arranged leisure activity materials that each student with disabilities preferred (e.g., magazines, board game materials). Then, they asked a peer who was in a peer buddy program to hang out with a student with disabilities using a leisure material that the student with disabilities selected. This verbal directive was delivered when a peer was engaging in a leisure activity at lunch or during physical education class. The results indicated that this simple intervention increased not only frequency but the quality of peer interactions of students with ID such as use of different communication modes (e.g., speaking sentences or words, gestures) and various conversation topics (e.g., peers, jokes, movies).

Haring and Breen (1992) used typically developing peers’ social network to improve social interactions of two middle school students with disabilities (i.e., a student with ID and a student with ASD). They first identified two peers who (a) were enrolled in the same classes as the students with disabilities, (b) had the same on-campus jobs, (c) had similar interests as the students with disabilities; (d) had acquaintanceship prior to the intervention, and (e) the students with disabilities showed interests in. Then, the researchers established a social network by asking the two peers to bring four to five intimate friends, respectively. The participants with disabilities learned names of their
network group members by practicing name-face correspondence with an instructor twice a week for 15 minutes in a special education classroom.

Each network group made a support schedule to help students with disabilities interact with peers for a 5-minutes transition period and lunch time. According to a support schedule, the group members initiated a contact with the members with disabilities (e.g., talking about age-appropriate topics, eye-contact, increasing proximity), prompted them to use interaction strategies and praised appropriate interactions. They also recorded an occurrence and nonoccurrence of an interaction during a transition period, rated its appropriateness (i.e., good, okay, or not good) if an interaction occurred, and comments or suggestions for the students with disabilities and/or their group work. An adult facilitator and a special education classroom teacher ensured that the students with disabilities were in the right location during each transition period.

In addition, the groups held a 30-minute weekly meeting with a student with disabilities to (a) review social interactions in the previous week, (b) discuss strategies for improving interactions of the student with disabilities (e.g., developing a list of peer initiations and social topics that peers frequently used), and (c) practice the strategies together using role-play and modeling. The results of this intervention indicated that the social network intervention was effective in increasing peer interactions and appropriate responding behaviors of the participants with disabilities. Both participants with disabilities wanted to keep interacting with their network members. The participant peers were all satisfied with the intervention, and the majority of them perceived their members with disabilities as friends.
*Peer grouping with support.* Kennedy and Itkonen (1994) examined the changes in social network of three high school students with ID after grouping the students with peers in general education classes with some additional supports. The participants with ID for this study were originally not included in general education classes, but received vocational training. Kennedy and Itkonen, however, asked them to participate in one general education class for a school day during the research.

With a special education teacher’s orientation for peers in the target classes (i.e., art, English, family science, or life science), general and special education teachers grouped the students with ID and peers who volunteered to be in the groups. The teachers also provided modified tasks to meet IEP goals and educational needs of the participants with ID. Kennedy and Itkonen (1994) reported that the participants with ID increased (a) frequency of peer interactions and (b) the number of new peers without disabilities who the students with ID met following the intervention. These students with ID perceived peers to be socially important after the intervention more than before.

**Discussion.** I reviewed 36 studies examining inclusive education practices for adolescents with ID. Twenty-one studies targeted middle school students with ID, 13 studies included high school students with ID, and two studies (Collins et al., 2007; Kennedy et al., 1997) included both middle and high school students with ID. This review indicated seven types of inclusive education practices for adolescents with ID as follow: (a) peer support arrangements, (b) embedded instruction, (c) inquiry lessons, (d) the SDLMI, (e) self-management strategies, (f) cooperative learning and (g) peer-mediated social supports including peer buddy program (Schaefer & Armentrout, 2002),
peer grouping (Kennedy & Itkonen, 1994), social network intervention (Haring & Breen, 1992), and verbal directives to peer buddies (Hughes, Copeland, Wehmeyer, et al., 2002).

Researchers have repeatedly reported consistent effects of embedded instruction and peer support arrangements. Embedded instruction was effective in making academic progress of adolescents with ID across nine studies. Peer support arrangements have shown mixed results regarding class participation of students with ID, but have been reported to result in increasing their peer interactions. Self-management strategies including the SDLMI consistently showed positive effects on increasing participation of students with ID in class activities throughout six studies. Considering one or two studies used inquiry lesson, cooperative learning, and each of the peer-mediated social supports only with middle school students with ID in limited inclusive contexts, more studies using these practices need to be done in different inclusive contexts both in middle and high schools.

**Inclusive education practices for adolescents with ID in South Korea.** This review explored inclusive education practices for adolescents with ID that (a) were conducted in South Korea, (b) included at least one student with ID educated in a middle or high school; and (c) attempted to demonstrate the effects of an inclusive education practices (i.e., experimental study). I excluded studies if they were quasi-experimental studies (e.g., E. Lim & Paik, 2011) or provided only descriptions of existing inclusive practices or models. I used a Korean governmental database system (i.e., RISS; www.riss.kr).

I used relatively broader search terms comparing to the literature review on inclusive education practices for adolescents with ID conducted in US. This is because
search results were limited when employing the same terms that I used for the American literature review on the same topic. For this review, I formed search terms by combining the following key words of each category: (a) *intellectual disability, mental retardation*; and (b) *middle school, high school, inclusive education, inclusive class, self-management, self-monitoring, self-determination, peer, friend, cooperative learning*. I also used the following practice terms that I identified in the American review: (a) *embedded instruction*, (b) *peer support arrangements*, (c) *peer support*, and (d) *inquiry lesson*.

**Results.** The total number of search results was 2,141. As a result of excluding duplicated studies and applying the search criteria, only four studies (i.e., Kong, Kang, & Kwak, 2009; Kook & Paik, 2013; H. J. Lim, 2017; Shim & Shin, 2007) were included in this review. Kong et al. (2009) and H. J. Lim (2017) implemented curricular and/or instructional adaptation combined with other strategies. Kong et al. modified objectives of two inclusive classes (i.e., Basic skills of agriculture, Conservation of environment) for three high school students with ID by lowering task difficulty and reducing the number of tasks and provided them with peer tutoring, one-to-one instructions, visual prompts, and reinforcement in the inclusive classes. Kong et al. presented some examples of modified objectives (e.g., naming each part of a microscope instead of using a microscope to observe a leaf) and instructional supports (e.g., peer tutoring, presentation of visual cues), but they did not describe the procedures for performing other intervention strategies. They reported that this packaged intervention was effective in increasing the participants’ class engagement and task completion.

H. J. Lim (2017) combined curricular adaptation with self-evaluation and token economy. Three middle school students with ID received this intervention in inclusive
classes. The class subject was Technology Home Economics. Although H. J. Lim provided some orientation for the general education teacher charged in that class to learn (a) participants’ learning characteristics and (b) purposes, necessity, different types, and methods of curricular adaptations, the modified materials were developed by the researcher for this study rather than by the teacher. H. J. Lim also asked the students with ID to perform self-evaluation of their attitude in class using a 5-point Likert scale and implemented a token economy based on the results of the evaluation. This study indicated that the intervention package was effective in increasing class engagement and decreasing off-task behaviors.

Kook and Paik (2013) and Shim and Shin (2007) developed packaged interventions based on their functional behavior assessment (FBA) results and self-management strategies. Kook and Paik identified that a middle school student with ID engaged in problem behaviors including out-of-seat, tearing out a book, banging a table, and yelling to gain teacher and/or peer attention and to escape from task demands. Their intervention consisted of (a) providing modified class materials based on adjusted objectives, (b) self-monitoring of the student’s appropriate behaviors in class (e.g., in-seat, following a teacher’s direction), and (c) differential reinforcement of the appropriate behaviors using a menu of reinforcers (e.g., stickers, teacher clapping, opportunity of greeting with others). This intervention was conducted in inclusive classes (i.e., social studies), special education classes, and a rehabilitation center. Kook and Paik reported that this intervention was effective in decreasing the target problem behaviors and increasing class engagement.
These results, however, seemed to include some threats to internal validity. Their visual data showed that they implemented the intervention when baseline data presented a clear therapeutic trend (i.e., decreases in problem behaviors and increases in class engagement) in the special education classroom and rehabilitation center settings. Kook and Paik (2013) did not provide information on this issue. Only data in inclusive class settings represented immediacy of effects without a therapeutic trend in the baseline condition.

Shim and Shin (2007) included goal setting, self-monitoring, self-reinforcement (i.e., self-recruiting teacher attention), self-evaluation, and a token economy on the basis of their FBA results. Three middle school students with ID participated in this study, and the function of their target problem behaviors (i.e., yelling, physical and verbal aggression) was commonly teacher and peer attention. Shim and Shin trained the participants in using self-management strategies in a special education classroom before intervention conditions. Unlike Kook and Paik (2013), most of the data were collected in special education classrooms, and data in inclusive classes (i.e., art, music, ethics) were collected during only one session per condition. Shim and Shin concluded that their intervention decreased the three participants’ target problem behaviors. The visual data for all three participants showed no overlapping data between conditions, consistent pattern in each condition, and immediacy of the intervention effects. Shim and Shin also noted that the students continued to use the self-management strategies two weeks later after withholding the intervention.

**Discussion.** Although the number of studies was small, Korean studies examining inclusive education practices for adolescents with ID seemed to show some differences
from the American studies on the same topic. First, researchers were the main intervention agents. The studies did not include trainings for practitioners or peers. Second, curricular adaptation and self-management strategies were the dominant practices. Third, even though curricular adaptation was used for three studies, only one study measured academic achievement. Most of the studies focused on improving behaviors in class (e.g., class engagement, decreases in problem behaviors). Fourth, no study targeted peer interactions of adolescents with ID in inclusive settings. Finally, no study applied embedded instruction or peer support arrangements that were well researched and turned out to be evidence-based practices in American studies. This review may have limitations in that (a) a small number of studies was included, and (b) I may have missed some studies that met the search criteria.

Chapter III. Method

The design for this research was a qualitative case study using interviews to explore knowledge and desires of parents of middle school students with ID regarding inclusive education laws and practices in South Korea.

Research Design

A qualitative case study that I used for this research focuses on complexity and uniqueness of a case (Simon, 2009). South Korean parents’ desires and knowledge regarding inclusive education were complex and unique in that they involved Korean culture, characteristics of their children’s ages and disabilities, and their personal values. Specifically, the design for this research was an instrumental qualitative case study, as Creswell (2011) categorized, because this study was to explore legal protections and supports for inclusive education for students with ID that parents knew and desired. The
underlying paradigm of this study was interpretivism, which involves inductive reasoning, searching for patterns, and seeking pluralism to understand and interpret a complex phenomenon (Glesne, 2014).

**Selection of Participants**

I purposefully recruited seven parents who (a) had a child with ID currently attending an inclusive middle school, (b) lived together with the child in South Korea, and (c) the child with ID was eligible for special education due to ID as determined by a local educational agency. I excluded (a) parents of a child with ID at middle school ages who transferred from a general education school to a special school, (b) parents who did not live with the child with ID, (c) parents whose child with ID was not eligible for special education as determined by a local educational agency, or (d) parents whose child had ID and other disabilities (e.g., ID and visual impairments, ID and emotional/behavioral disorders) and gained eligibility for special education due to other disabilities, not ID. I set these exclusion criteria to collect appropriate data to examine parents’ desire for inclusive education in the context of current inclusive settings for middle school students with ID.

I created a recruitment flyer written in Korean. The flyer consisted of (a) the title and purpose of my research, (b) inclusion criteria for selecting participants, (c) specific procedures that a participant would be asked to do, (e) description of a free seminar on inclusive education that participants can choose to attend and (f) my contact information. I distributed this flyer from July 15th to 20th, 2018 by emailing the officer of the South Korean parent organization and uploading it on the websites of local educational agencies.
and rehabilitation centers for people with disabilities in South Korea. I chose these areas because I had easy access to them.

I initially recruited four participants who lived in Boryeong Chungcheongnam-do in South Korea. One special education teacher notified me that four parents of her students were interested in this research on the 25th of July, 2018. She worked in a middle school in Boryeong. When she gained the parents’ agreement for my contact on the phone, I individually called them and found all of them met my selection criteria. I recruited another participant who lived in Incheon through one of these parents and then two more parents in Incheon through this new participant in August 2018. I terminated participant recruitment in August 31st 2018 after I confirmed the three parents in Incheon met my participant criteria.

**Case Description**

All participants for this research were mothers of students with ID who attended an inclusive middle school. Their children took classes with typically developing children in general education classrooms for most of their time in school, and participated in some pullout programs in special education classrooms. As seen in Table 6, these mothers were born in between 1974 and 1981 (at the age from 38 to 45) in South Korea. Their current residential areas were divided into two cities that included a rural area (Boryeong) and a metropolitan city (Incheon). Boryeong (Area = 219.7 mi²) is a small harbor city that is located on the coast of Yellow Sea and 87.5 miles from the capital of South Korea (Seoul). It has 103,198 residents, and 22.7% of them work in agriculture or the fishing industry ("보령의 주요통계 [Statistics of Boryeong],” 2019). Most of the places in this
city represent typical rural areas in South Korea, having hills and farmland around houses.

Three participants, except Felicia’s mother, lived in a relatively developed area in Boryeong where there were high multi-story apartment buildings distant from farmlands and harbors. Felicia’s mother lived in a farming area. Amy’s mother was born in Incheon and had lived in urban cities (Incheon, Daegu), but the mothers of Betty and Caesar, Dori, and Felicia had never lived in urban cities. Their jobs were different and not particularly targeted to people with disabilities. None of them were involved in a parent organization for children with disabilities. Amy’s mother said she never participated in parent training. Dori’s mother stated she used to attend the training through a rehabilitation center for people with disabilities when Dori was young (before Dori entered school). Betty’s mother said that she might have gone to the training but was not able to remember what she learned from such training. I was not able to ask Felicia’s mother about her participation in a parent organization because she did not respond to my request for member check.

All participants living in Boryeong had multiple children that included those with ID. Amy’s mother and Dori’s mother had typically developing children other than Amy and Dori. Betty’s mother expressed her interest in this research through Betty’s school, but her son (Caesar - Betty’s older brother) was also a middle school student with ID, meeting the participant selection criteria for this research. After I gained her agreement, I included her statements about both Betty and Caesar in this research. Whereas, Felicia’s mother had a son with ID, but I did not analyze what she mentioned regarding the son
(Felicia’s younger brother who has ID) because he was an elementary school student, not a middle school student.

The mothers of Evan, Gus, and Harry lived in the Incheon metropolitan city (Area = 372.4 mi²). This city is also located on the coast of Yellow Sea but closer to the capital of South Korea (16.8 miles far from Seoul) than Boryeong. Incheon is included in the Seoul Capital Area (“Incheon,” 2019). The number of residents in this city is three times more than those in Boryeong \( (n = 3,027,268; \text{“2019 년 6 월말 기준 인천광역시 인구현황 [The current number of residents in the Incheon metropolitan city in June 2019],” 2019}) \). People living in Incheon mostly have jobs in the manufacturing industry (23.2%) or mining (23.2%), and only 0.3% of them work in agriculture or fishing industry (Incheon Metropolitan City, 2018). Incheon is well known for the oldest and largest international airport in South Korea.

All of the participants living in Incheon (mothers of Evan, Gus, and Harry) were members of a parent organization. This organization is the Incheon branch of the nationwide South Korean parent organization for children with disabilities. The mothers of Evan and Harry had jobs that transport people with disabilities from one place to another by car. They both stated that they were motivated to get this job as they have brought up their children with ID. They said that trainings provided by this job were helpful for their understanding of the children with ID. These mothers expressed that they were interested in parent trainings and had participated in additional parent trainings held by the parent organization. Gus’s mother, however, said that she did not think parent trainings are practically helpful for her, and she never attended a parent training. She was not involved in a job related to people with disabilities. Like the mothers living in
Boryeong, mothers of Evan, Gus, and Harry had other children in addition to their child with ID, but these other children all were typically developing children (siblings of Evan, Gus, and Harry).

**Positionality**

I am an advocate for appropriate supports that allow students with disabilities to enjoy equal rights to education in inclusive settings. I view disability as the outcome of interactions between an individual’s impairment and environments consistent with the social model of disability. From this perspective, I think that denial of appropriate supports for these students would be a school’s neglect of these students’ right to education. I deny a utilitarian approach to educational supports that prioritizes benefits to the majority of students and accepts sacrifices of a small number of students for the majority. This position is consistent with the second principle of Rawls’s theory of justice in that I believe just an approach to education would involve unequal distribution of resources and supports to assure equal access to education considering the diversity of students.

I have an understanding of the South Korean Confucian culture as I lived in South Korea for 32 years (in metropolitan cities during my childhood and the countryside after college). I used to participate in Confucian family rites worshiping ancestors (e.g., great grandmother, great-great grandfather) with the belief that they protect and bless my family. My family no longer performs these Confucian rites because we worship God, not ancestors, after we converted to Christianity. The Confucian ethics, however, continued to influence my life even after the conversion. As I worked in schools for over 10 years in South Korea, I learned that I should respect the authoritative leadership of
school principals, vice principals, and senior teachers to avoid conflicts and maintain peace in the workplace. When I worked as a special education teacher in inclusive schools, I tended to expect general education teachers to protect and assure the rights of my students with disabilities without asking them to provide specific supports for the students. This was because I was concerned that such a request could create a conflict with the interests of a greater number of students and I did not want to face a conflict with the teachers. I also learned that it would be virtuous behavior to sacrifice personal interests for the good of a group of people.

These Confucian lessons learned through my daily life in South Korea were challenged since I lived in the US for the past six years for my doctoral study. In the first semester of this study, it was impressive that one student asked a professor to repeat the professor’s statement in the middle of her lecture for the reason that the student missed it. The professor stopped the lecture and said what she already said before only for that student. I often faced this kind of situation thereafter. From these experiences, I learned that support requests for a small number of students would be naturally accepted without being morally blamed. I also gained training in using laws to advocate equal rights of children with disabilities.

I have some understanding of students with ID in South Korea. I studied special education from bachelor to doctoral courses and taught students with ID for nine years in South Korea. I taught these students in different settings including a special school for students with ID, a special education classroom in a psychiatric hospital, and a special education classroom in a general education school. Although I am a professional in
special education and passionate about advocating for children with ID and their families, I may not be an expert in parental knowledge and desires, considering I am not a parent.

Taken together, my position for this research is on an outsider. Although I have some understanding of the South Korean culture and school life of children with ID in South Korea, I have no experience in the schools that participants’ children attended and have no relationship with them. I was born and brought up in South Korea, but my knowledge and desires regarding inclusive education were largely influenced by the social model of disability and Rawls’s theory of justice that (a) is based the American scholarly approach to inclusive education and advocacy for children with disabilities, and (b) were inconsistent with the prevalent approach to disability and justice in South Korea.

**Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval**

This study received the IRB approval from the University of New Mexico. The initial approval date was July 11\(^{th}\) 2018. This approval was closed on May 30\(^{th}\) 2019 when I finished data collection.

**Data Collection**

I individually interviewed participants using semi-structured and open-ended interview questions (Appendix A) from July 25th to August 8th in 2018. Although I started an interview with each of these questions, I also asked unplanned questions to gain an understanding of the participant’s statements as I followed what she said. I reworded a question when a participant did not seem to understand the question. I spoke Korean during interviews because all of the participants used Korean as their first language.
Based on the participants’ preferences, I conducted face-to-face interviews with three of them (mothers of Amy, Betty and Caesar, and Dori) in a coffee shop room near their home. The same coffee shop was used for these mothers. I interviewed the remaining four mothers on the telephone. Duration of the interviews differed, ranging from 70 minutes to 114 minutes. I stopped data collection with each participant for each interview question when I found no new data from the interviewee’s communication (e.g., repetitive statements about the person’s ignorance of or no interest in inclusive education laws). I audiotaped all of the interviews after individually gaining the participants’ consent.

Data Analysis

I transcribed each interview using a software, “Transcribe” (retrieved from https://transcribe.wreally.com/). This software allowed me to transcribe interview recordings at my own pace. It stopped, played, and replayed a segment of an audiotaped interview when I wanted to do so by clicking a relevant button above a box for transcription on the web page. These transcripts were written in Korean as the interviewees and I used Korean during interviews.

I translated each transcript into English after I finished its transcription. As seen in Appendix B, I made a list of Korean words and phrases that might not be literally translated into English to convey their meanings (e.g., idioms). I then discussed their translation with my doctoral advisor who is a native English speaker and a professional in understanding parents of children with ID. After revising the list based on the discussion, I gained advice on words and phrases on the revised list from a certified translator who has provided translation for the Korean American Association and has done research with
Korean Americans. In addition, I asked six participants (except Felicia’s mother) about some parts of their statements to make sure what they meant. These participants confirmed most of the parts, but Dori’s mother corrected my understanding of her story about Dori’s bullying victimization. I changed a subject and object in two translated sentences in her transcript thereafter.

Next, I conducted a thematic analysis. I believed that the thematic analysis would be appropriate for this research because its strength matches the purpose of this research. As noted by Glesne (2015), the thematic analysis “helps reveal underlying complexities…and to explain where and why people differ from a general pattern” (p. 184). This is consistent with the focus of this research in that this study explored complexities of desires and knowledge of a particular group of people (parents of middle school students). Throughout the procedures, I consulted analytic memos that I made during translation and preceded analysis procedures. These memos included a data pattern within a participant, repetitiveness of data, and connection of data to my theoretical framework.

A thematic analysis involves inductive process that consisted of (a) coding, (b) categorizing, (c) forming themes, and (d) making conclusions (Mayan, 2009; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). I first conducted vivo coding and descriptive coding. Vivo coding is to code data using a word or phrase that was on the transcript and represented the story in a sentence or paragraph, and descriptive coding is to use a word or a phrase that summarizes the sentence or paragraph (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2013, p. 74). For this procedure, I used transcripts that were written in both Korean and English (see Appendix C) to make English codes consistent with the inherent meaning of what the
participant said in Korean. Although most of these codes were written in English, I placed both Korean and English codes on some parts of data to constantly consider their nuance for the followed procedures. Once I finished open coding with all participants’ data, I made categories based on similarities of the codes.

I used Dedoose version 8.2.14 (retrieved from https://www.dedoose.com/) for theming. First, I uploaded all of the transcripts to Dedoose and created a list of the categories on this software. I then reread each transcript after opening it at Dedoose and placed categories on it by selecting a sentence or a paragraph and clicking a relevant category on the right side of the web page. As I reread the transcripts several times for this procedure, I removed, created, or renamed some categories when I found them insufficient to represent all of the relevant codes throughout the transcripts. I finally made themes that embraced similarities of the categories and sequences of these categories that were commonly shown in the transcripts.

Validity

I used five procedures to strengthen validity of this research. First, I checked accuracy of my transcription of recorded interview data by reviewing each transcript while listening to the relevant recording. I added some pause and vocalization (e.g., weeping, laughing) to the initial transcripts through this procedure. Second, I reread and re-coded transcripts to confirm if my codes were plausible. I checked if each category represented codes that I incorporated into the category. I also reviewed excerpts under each category to find if the category summarizes each of the excerpts. I changed categories of some excerpts during this procedure. Third, I made notes of data discrepant from each theme and described them under the themes. For example, all mothers except
for Felicia’s mother talked about communication that they initiated to ask for teachers’ protection of their children with ID. I described these data as the mother’s protection request under the theme of mother-teacher communication, and I then subsequently stated the discrepant data collected from Felicia’s mother: “Felicia’s mother said that she tried not to call teacher because a special education teacher texted her if there was something to know Felicia’s school events” (p.113).

Fourth, I asked a scholar colleague who was originally from South Korea, fluently uses Korean and English, and is an associate professor in language, literacy, and sociocultural studies to review my data analysis. She commented that some codes, categories, and themes did not specifically represent my participants’ knowledge and desires that were my research questions but seemed like general categories. Because I thought this comment was reasonable, I reviewed my data analysis from coding to theming and reworded some codes, categories, and themes with a focus on the participating mothers’ knowledge and desires that they said. For example, I changed the first theme from ‘the school's protection by reaction to problems’ to ‘mother-teacher communication,’ considering that the mothers knew teachers communicated with them mostly when they initiated the communication but desired teacher-initiated communication.

She disagreed with my interpretation of the second and third themes (particular knowledge that suppressed further desires for inclusive education, culture-based advocacy for inclusive education). While I linked data related to these themes to the Korean Confucian culture, she viewed this phenomenon as an influence of the colonial culture formed during the Japanese colonial period. I provided her with details about my
theoretical framework, specifically about Confucianism. She then stated that my interpretation would be persuasive when using that framework. Considering this comment, I clarified how I used the theoretical framework in chapter five so that readers could easily understand my interpretation of data and conclusion of this research.

Fifth, I conducted member check with six participants on the phone from April 21st to May 6th in 2019. During member checking, I (a) asked several questions to make sure if my understanding of their statements was right, and (b) asked about their birth year, religion, and job because my theoretical framework revised during data analysis was related to the information. I did not conduct a member check with Felicia’s mother because she did not respond to my request for it. My member check with six participants lasted between 22 min and 46 min. I audiotaped member check after gaining their admission. Most of the participants confirmed my understanding of their interviews. They also added some data to the initial transcripts (e.g., changing Amy’s educational placement, improvement of Harry’s peer relationships).

Chapter IV. Results

The purpose of this study was to examine the knowledge and desires of parents of middle school students with ID regarding inclusive education practices and laws in South Korea. I interviewed seven mothers of children with ID who attended South Korean middle school. Table 7 presents the results of the data analysis (themes and categories by participants). In this chapter, I described three themes that emerged from the interview data: (a) mother-teacher communication, (b) particular knowledge that suppressed further desires for inclusive education, and (c) culture-based advocacy.
**Mother-Teacher Communication**

The mothers commonly spoke about their communication with teachers. Six of them indicated that they usually initiated communication with teachers when they suspected their children’s victimization of school violence. Felicia’s mother said that she tried not to call teachers because a special education teacher texted her if there was something to know about Felicia’s school events. All of the mothers desired to have teacher-initiated communication that would enable them to gain information on their children with ID and advice on parenting.

**Protection request with different intensity.** The mothers living in two cities noted the different intensity of their requests to lead to teachers’ interventions to protect their children with ID. I defined the intensity as a level of mothers’ efforts to make teachers provide appropriate interventions. The mothers living in Boryeong used a simple report on the phone to ask for teachers’ work on their children’s victimization. I viewed this level of request as mild intensity. These mothers also commonly indicated their trust in teachers. The mother of Betty and Caesar indicated her mild protection request and trust in teachers as below.

The Help room [special education] teacher takes care of my kid... I called and told the Help room teacher that Caesar lent some money to peers, but they didn’t give it back to him. The teacher then found which students borrowed the money [from Caesar] and helped him get the money back. … the teacher does everything for us. The teacher does whatever we ask to do if I call the teacher. It’s amazing to see how the teacher addresses our problems.
Dori’s mother stated, “every teacher makes efforts to teach students well.” Even when she did not hear about what a teacher did in response to her report of Dori’s victimization, she believed that the teacher should have disciplined the students who teased Dori.

Some of her classmates teased her. Some kids, who speak well, made the fun of Dori by taking her backpack in the last spring. She came home crying several times after school because of that [peer teasing]. So, I called her teacher, and then the teacher seemed to discipline the kids.

Although Amy’s mother stated that Amy had never been a victim of school violence, she presented a similar pattern that entailed her trust in teachers’ positive responses to her requests and her use of mild requests. For example, when she heard that Amy felt ashamed of having a disability and did not want to go to special education classrooms, she simply asked a teacher to change Amy’s educational placement to full inclusion and keep Amy’s diagnosis in secret to the other students.

You know, Amy is in a sensitive season of her life. So, I told her homeroom teacher that I don’t want to make Amy’s disability in public. So, the teacher has kept it until now.

In sum, the mothers in Boryeong stated their efforts for child protection in school using a simple request on the phone without challenging or appealing to teachers. These simple requests were paired with their trust in teachers.

Whereas, the mothers living in Incheon commonly noted that teachers are less likely to protect their children with ID if they make a mild request. These mothers all talked about their disappointment in teachers’ reactions. Gus’s mother got frustrated by a
teacher’s ineffective discipline that was seen to cause more serious school violence. She told Gus’s homeroom teacher that some students shot a rubber band at Gus. Three days later, another incident of school violence occurred, and Gus got serious eye injury because of the incident. She said she regretted after this incident that she trusted the teacher.

I called his homeroom teacher to report the incident [rubber band shot] and asked him to watch over Gus. The teacher told me that he reprimanded the two students, and so I did not take the issue seriously anymore. It was Thursday, and then the eye hurt incident happened on the next Monday…I just entrusted those incidents [school violence] to the homeroom teacher. I thought he was trustworthy and reliable because I heard that he had volunteered to help people with disabilities. However, a big incident occurred at the end of the second semester.

She got scared by the severity of Gus’s eye injury and then made a more intense request in a manner of challenging the teacher so that the teacher would appropriately discipline students who victimized Gus and thus protect him from future occurrences of those incidents.

The skin on his eye was torn up. The doctor said the injured spot was a vital point and so, he’d almost lost his eyesight. When I heard this from the doctor, I was very scared. So, I decided to speak up for this time. I didn’t send Gus to the school the next day after the incident. I just told the teacher that Gus looked shocked and then prepared for fighting against the school. I got the doctor’s note, and then I heard what happened to him from Gus himself. I also asked a student
without disabilities about the incident…I said to the teacher, “I will take the incident seriously this time. I have proof, a doctor’s note. I will go to the police office with this proof.”

She experienced that her intense voice made the teacher discipline the students more strongly than before.

I guess he got embarrassed when I told him that I would go to a police office and so, made the three students, who I mentioned, write a letter of apology. He also made them write everything that they have done to Gus on that letter…the teacher told me that he would task a drastic measure when those kids redo the things. So, I asked what the drastic measure is. He said, “It’s involuntary transfer.” Then, I said, “Ok, then, I will leave this problem with you.”

Also, the teacher’s examination of the incident followed by this mother’s strong voice revealed that Gus was victimized more seriously than the mother realized.

I told the teacher that three students hit Gus, but it turned out that 16 students had hit Gus. When my husband and I found this fact, we cried a lot.

Likewise, Gus’s mother showed a pattern that entailed her trust in teachers, the frustration of her trust, and an increase in the intensity of her requests.

Harry’s mother did not explicitly talk about her trust in teachers. Except for the trust, she indicated a similar pattern to Gus’s mother. Harry’s educational placement was full inclusion in elementary school. Harry’s mother told a special education teacher to change his placement to pull-out special education to gain the special education teacher’s consistent monitoring and protection from school violence victimization. This request, however, got rejected by the teacher.
I think students without disabilities are more likely to tease and hit those with disabilities as they advance to an upper grade. My kid speaks well, imitates others’ behavior well, and plays with other kids well. So, I think, other kids would know that they could be scolded [if they tease him] in the presence of teachers. Because they teased and hit him behind teachers’ back so many times, I told the special education teacher that I want to get her help, but the teacher said that she was short-handed.

She seemed to learn the importance of intense requests to gain teachers’ appropriate support from her experiences in Harry’s elementary school days.

We were not treated well in elementary school. For that reason, Harry had many issues with his peers. So, my husband and I thought that we should shake the school if those kinds of things happen to Harry again in middle school… We had this thought. Like, we would not stay calm if somebody hurt our kid. Other people around us also said we should kick the school’s ass one time! It would not work for us to talk to teachers nicely in our country. This is common sense. You know, just talking to teachers nicely would rather make things worse.

Evan’s mother said that she got frustrated when she noticed Evan’s homeroom teacher mistreated him in his early elementary school days. To protect Evan, she gave the teacher an implicit message, ‘do not harm Evan’, by writing about the incident as if Evan told her the incident. She said she had used the strategy since then.

I stayed at school in Evan’s first grade in elementary school. His teacher told me to do because Evan wandered around the school [out-of-seat] and the teacher cannot care for the behavior. One day, some students told me that the teacher
pushed him away. I guessed Evan came close to the teacher to see a computer because he likes computers, and then the teacher pushed him away. I couldn’t directly talk to him. So, I wrote, ‘Evan said at home, the teacher pushed me away. Did something happen [to him]?’ The teacher did not answer me, but it seemed that the teacher tried not to do that kind of behavior to Evan.

Evan’s mother spoke about a sexual issue and a relevant incident where Evan got involved.

A girl first touched Evan’s cheek and tried to hug him. But I think Evan touched the girl’s breast as he tried to put her hand away from him. The girl then told the homeroom teacher that Evan touched her breast…because a female student talked [about a sexual issue], people stood for the girl…When somebody asked Evan, “Did you do so?” then he said “Yes” and then again asked, “You didn’t so?” then he said “No.” But there was a friend [Evan’s peer] who spoke up for him. He said, he saw that it was not intentional and happened as Evan shook the girl’s hand off…

She believed that teachers would not stand by Evan if a sexual issue occurs with him because Evan is male.

I’ve seen many bad cases. I saw that a student with disabilities was forced to transfer to another school because he had a problem with a girl. He was even a student eligible for special education. I learned that boys would not get protection at all when they get involved in these sensitive sexual issues.

She asked Evan’s new homeroom teacher next year to tell girl students not to touch Evan in order to prevent Evan’s involvement in that kind of sexual issues.
…when Evan advanced to 2nd grade, I first told his homeroom teacher that “I would teach Evan not to touch girls and please teach girl students not to touch him first.”

This statement seemed more intense than a simple request because it was a conditional request that involved not only what she asked the teacher to do but what she would do to Evan. Taken together, the mothers in Incheon expressed a stronger intensity of their protection requests than those in Boryeong. All participants except Felicia’s mother, however, stated that they typically initiated communication with teachers for safety of their children with ID.

Desires for teacher-initiated communication. All of the mothers desired that teachers would initiate communication with them to provide information on their children with ID and give advice on mothers’ behavior for the children with ID.

Provision of information on the child’s school life. All of the mothers reported that they did not know much about how their children with ID were doing in school. Four mothers expressed desires for gaining information on their children with ID from teachers. Evan’s mother wanted teachers to tell her anything about his school life, “even a very small thing.”

I like a teacher who communicates with parents well, not like calling parents only when something bad happened. I think our current homeroom teacher is very good. The teacher always makes some notes in his notebook. The note is not about the entire school day, but it’s like ‘Evan said hi to me very loudly this morning’ and ‘He looked very happy today. Did he have a good thing last day?’ Things like that. I sometimes reply to it. I like these interactions.
Similarly, Felicia’s mother described the best teacher who provided details about what he did for Felicia and how Felicia did in response to his practices in class. She said, “I felt good when I knew that he taught her one after another.”

Dori’s mother said that she did not know much about Dori’s troubles in school because both Dori and teachers did not tell her what happened to Dori in school. She desired that teachers talk to her when something bad occurred to Dori.

When a problem comes up, I hope teachers talk to me before they do something for Dori. They never talked to me early when that kind of incident occurred. For this reason, I had many things that I didn’t know about her. When Dori comes back home with tears in her eyes after school, she hardly tells me about what happened to her in school. I am not the type of person who often visits the school to complain. I hope the teachers tell me about it. For Dori, a problem could be a very big thing. So, I hope teachers tell me first [about Dori’s problems in school].

I don’t know well about what is happening to her in school.

The mother of Betty and Caesar also said that she wanted future teachers who let her know when something happened to her children.

I just want them [teachers] to treat my kids well. And if kids hit Caesar, I hope they handle that kind of issues well as this middle school does…I hope they call and tell us details about what happened to the kids. Like, how the kid was hit.

**Teachers’ guidance of the mother’s support.** Four mothers liked teachers who voluntarily gave them advice on parenting. Harry’s mother described a “good” teacher who guided her to support Harry for his meaningful participation in a class activity.
There was an activity of making PPT slides and a video in Harry’s 6th grade. Other teachers may say, Harry doesn’t have to do the activity because it is too difficult for him, but the teacher told me that Harry could make a video with me focusing on swimming because Harry has trained in swimming, and his interest is in swimming. The teacher said that he could collect resources on that topic and make simple PPT slides with me so that he was able to present his slides and video to peers. Whenever the class had presentation activities, the teacher helped Harry make a presentation this way.

A good teacher in the memory of Dori’s mother was the teacher who gave her advice for good mothering and collaborated with her for Dori’s learning.

… He asked me to read a particular part of a book with her and then discuss it together so that her speech skill was improved. The teacher was really good… He told me how I could help Dori communicate and engage in discussion better. So, I got his help a lot. I liked that kind of thing… I often visited the school because I got much help [from the teacher]. I liked it because he told me a lot. You know, it’s good to have more knowledge.

Amy’s mother expressed her gratitude to Amy’s previous homeroom teacher because the teacher gave advice for Amy’s learning although the advice was against her thought.

I initially felt disappointed by the teacher, but later on, I thought what she told me was for the good of my kid… It was like advice for me and my daughter. I think the teacher gave me corrective advice. Like, “think again,” And the teacher talked to my daughter, “It is not a shameful thing,” and let her tell other children, “I am
the same as you are, but I’m a little late because I was sick.” Because she [the
teacher] thought that way and told me so, I think she was the best.

Following this teacher’s advice, Amy’s mother changed her thought that was to place
Amy in full inclusion for her to avoid shamefulness of going to a special education
classroom. She said that she “came to think about it again and followed [the teacher’s
advice] from the second semester.” Amy’s mother contrasted this teacher with previous
teachers who “just told her yes, yes, yes, yes [whatever I asked them to do]. She preferred
teachers who give her advice for the good of Amy rather than those who do whatever she
asks them to do.

Gus’s mother said that she found Gus’s medical issue thanks to a teacher’s advice.
She described that this teacher was the best. The teacher recommended for her to check
Gus’s health in a hospital after reporting to her that Gus vomited in a bus on the way back
from an amusement park.

When Gus was returning from an amusement park in his 6th grade, he vomited in
the bus. His homeroom teacher at that time texted me; Gus seemed very dizzy,
and asked me to see a doctor with him because the teacher was not sure whether it
was simply motion sickness or not… the teacher called me with a worried voice
on the next day. I’ve never had such a good teacher.

Following this teacher’s advice, she went to see a doctor with Gus and found that Gus
better not go on the rides in an amusement park because his brain damage is negatively
affected by that activity. She viewed this teacher’s advice as “benevolence” because none
of the previous teachers gave her advice on it, although Gus had been to an amusement
park multiple times as a field trip throughout his entire elementary school days.
I cannot forget about him… He [Gus] walked with faltering steps and wanted to lie on a bed whenever he came back from an amusement park and was too sick to go to the school the next day… You know, kids in elementary school often go to an amusement park for a field trip. He must have been to amusement parks several times for the six years in elementary school, but I didn’t know about this. I just thought it was just because of his weakness.

**Particular Knowledge That Suppressed Further Desires for Inclusive Education**

The mothers longed for their children with ID to truly belong to a group of students in their inclusive homeroom. They, however, did not expect fulfillment of this desire in the near future. These mothers had different levels of desires between the children’s academic and social outcomes through inclusive education, but they did not expect teachers’ implementation of inclusive education practices in both areas. Data indicated that the mothers did not actively want inclusive education practices on the basis of their moral and deficit-based approach to supports.

**Desires for the child’s belonging.** Five mothers indicated desires for belonging of their children with ID to a group of students in a homeroom. I define belonging as a sense of feeling that the child enjoys a membership of his or her homeroom group. A homeroom is a group of people that include an assigned general education teacher (i.e., homeroom teacher) and students who are placed in the same classroom by the school. Amy’s mother described desired inclusive education using a celebrity’s story on TV.

I saw a TV program about a vocalist of the group Revival. He had a son with autism. He sent the son to a school in the Philippines because there was no
separation of kids with disabilities in that country. The kids just help each other and universally make friends.

Felicia’s mother used a movie story (Wonder) to talk about her desires for no separation of Felicia from her homeroom group.

...when they go out to society, healthy people hang out with only healthy people, and persons with disabilities hang out with those with disabilities. So, I mean, I hope they’re equally and fairly [treated] without being separated…I watched a movie. Did you see that movie about a kid with a disability on the face? ...I thought that the kid was the same as other kids, but the only difference was he was small and had a disability on his face…So, I mean, equally. Treating equally to general kids and kids with disabilities.

She specified her desired context for Felicia’s inclusive education where Felicia not only receives help from peers but gives them help.

I think, if special and general kids in friendship are sitting close to each other, they may teach each other. It’s like one kid says, “I don’t know this.” Then the other kid can help the kid understand it. Also, a special kid can teach a general kid.

Evan’s mother did not explicitly describe that she desired Evan’s belonging to his homeroom group, but she negatively commented on the influence of a special education classroom on Evan’s sense of belonging to his inclusive homeroom.

Although our kids attend [a general education] school, I feel they did not belong to their assigned [general education] homeroom of the first grade but they belong to a special education classroom. Even when they advance to the second grade,
they belong to a special education classroom of the second grade. Do you know what I’m saying? I mean the sense of belonging. Literally inclusion, but feeling like a small special school in a [general education] school though [he] receives inclusive education.

This was consistent with Harry’s mother.

We [mothers of children with disabilities] also discussed, the meaning of installing a help room [special education classroom] within a general education school. Its existence would not be meaningful for inclusion. It’s like separation in the help room from general education classrooms. What we really want is full inclusion that makes our kids live with peers and learn with peers.

Dori’s mother said that she “hates” separate special education classes. She elaborated on how Dori would get emotionally hurt when she is moving to a special education classroom from her homeroom.

…it’s undeniable that Dori belongs to a special education classroom…I don’t like my kid transfers to a special education classroom. But it cannot be helped. She gets hurt a lot. When transferring, they go [to the special education classroom] alone, not with other kids. You know, she goes alone [to the special education classroom] when she has a special class. And the classrooms are located in the middle of the school.

Place-and-hope for social outcomes. The mothers all stated that the greatest benefit of inclusive education is natural opportunities for their children’s social development by being with typically developing peers. They expected that their children with ID would make a friend and improve communication skills during the time with
typically developing children. These mothers, however, pictured that their children with ID would not have been using this time productively for social development because the children had social deficits. They also did not expect teachers to support these children to develop social skills based on their consideration of teachers’ difficult circumstances to provide extra supports. I describe this pattern of data below using related excerpts from each participant’s transcripts.

Dori’s mother described that she aimed at improvement of Dori’s communication through her inclusive education.

The point is interactions with other kids [kids without disabilities]. But this is the most difficult thing for Dori. I think, if Dori is with these kids, she would have more chances to talk to them, see them, and have eye contact with them. She, however, predicted that Dori hardly communicates with typically developing peers. You know, she would be okay during class time when students are seated and passively listens to a teacher’s lecture. But she was different from her peers during free time, extracurricular activities, or sports festivals…When I went to her school for a sports festival, I saw that she was alone in the very back…Other kids were together, but she was always alone.

When I asked about her feeling about it, she paused for about three seconds and then said she “feel sad.” Despite this sadness, she did not expect teachers’ practices for the issue.

Interviewer: I think teachers could do something about that issue.

Dori’s mother: No, it’s a sports festival. They all are busy following their schedules. So, they cannot take care of only this kid.
She also expressed her desires that Dori makes a friend with typically developing children.

I hope my kid could go watching a movie with friends, but she doesn’t. I think she could do so, but she doesn’t. For this kind of thing, I hope a teacher helps her…I think a little support would be very helpful for her.

Although she expressed her desire for teacher support to help Dori get along with the other students, she subsequently said, “I think teachers may not have time to do so because she has 30 students in the homeroom.”

Betty’s mother presented a similar pattern that included (a) her expectation of Betty’s friendship development during the time with typically developing children in school, (b) Betty’s social isolation, and (c) attribution of the social isolation to Betty’s personal difficulties such as rare talking and poor social skills. Like the other mothers, she did not show her expectations of teachers’ interventions for Betty to make a friend. Instead, she described a special education classroom as a place where Betty got out of social isolation in school because she had some friends there.

Interviewer: Would you like an afterschool program with kids without disabilities in a general education classroom or kids with disabilities in a special education classroom for Betty if both programs are provided for free?

Betty’s mother: (Laughter) I think the thing in the special education classroom is better for Betty. It’s because I think Betty would not like to take a program with general kids… It’s because she doesn’t have a friend because she doesn’t talk. It seemed that she just stays in her seat even at recess except for the time when she needs to go to a restroom. But she got some friends in the special education
classroom. So, I think afterschool programs in the special education classroom would be better for her.

Felicia’s mother valued inclusive education for Felicia’s opportunities to get along with typically developing peers. She desired Felicia’s friendship development during her school days but described neither Felicia’s skill deficits nor her desires for teachers’ interventions for Felicia’s friendship development. This mother exceptionally stated that she took action against Felicia’s social isolation and gained teachers’ environmental arrangements for her positive peer relationships.

In the beginning, she didn’t adjust to school well, so she used to carry a coloring book. [I asked] “Why do you take it to school?” Then, she said, “other kids are playing together after the school bell rings [during recess], but mom, I don’t have a friend yet.” …Because of that, I called the teacher. Then, I heard that the teacher had a one-to-one consultation with other kids. The teacher told them not to bully Felicia. Now I heard that Felicia made one friend. I didn’t see her [the friend] though.

Amy’s mother desired that Amy develop and enjoy friendship with typically developing children. She stated that Amy’s limitations in language use would be an obstacle to friendship development. This mother did not expect teachers’ interventions to promote Amy’s language use and friendship development. She perceived that her previous mistake made Amy have current limitations in peer relationships.

The doctor also suggested a one-year delay in Amy’s entrance to elementary school to wait for her language development before school entrance. He said cognitive ability requires speech skills. But I just sent Amy to the elementary
school without delay…Amy made friends and played with other kids well in lower grades. This was possible because her peers were young and thus [their developmental status] was the same [as Amy’s developmental status].

Considering this, I think we should have sent her school a little later. My husband and I said that we have no choice now, though.

She described the improvement of Amy’s peer relationships during my member check, eight months later after the interview. She still did not expect teachers’ interventions for Amy’s peer relationships, but she seemed to learn that the atmosphere in Amy’s new classroom led to this improvement.

I felt the atmosphere of her classroom in the second grade [last year] was too dry, and the children were a little harsh because there were girl students only. But here now are both girls and boys in her classroom. So, girl students paid attention to Amy, and she also seemed to get along with them…the atmosphere is very different from that time.

Evan’s mother emphasized the value of having peer communication partners for Evan’s communication development through inclusive education.

It’s because my friend, kids like Evan, always have one-on-one training with a teacher…He answers adults well because speech-language therapy or sensory therapy teachers are mostly adults... But he is not interested in his peer friends at all. Although his peers approached him to do something good for him, he is not interested in them at all…You know, he will get along with his peers when he grows up. Their level would be high, and there would be an obvious gap between them and Evan though. Despite this fact, I thought, when he is young, inclusive
education is the only way for Evan to improve his language a lot with his peer friends.

Although Evan’s mother viewed peer interactions as a primary benefit from inclusive education, she predicted Evan’s few peer interactions in school and attributed this isolation as Evan’s autistic characteristic.

I guess he is always alone [in school], but Evan does not want to be in the peer group because he has a strong autistic disposition. You know kids with intellectual disability who have good social ability would want to get along with other kids even though their level is far lower than the other kids. But Evan does not. His style is like he comes when somebody calls him and goes when they say ‘go.’ (Laughter)

She did not expect teachers’ support for Evan’s interactions with his peers because she perceived that a general education school’s goal is different from Evan’s communication improvement.

… I sent him to an inclusive school because my priority is communication. But a priority of the school is placed on [academic] teaching. So, there is a gap. Really. She also said that she restricted support requests for Evan’s inclusive classes because of Evan’s communicational limitations.

It would rather be easy to get support if Evan’s limitation is only in academic areas, and he could follow teachers’ directions well. If so, I could say I want only full inclusion so that there would be no problem. However, his level is low. His verbal communication level is at four or five, like a preschool level. Because of
this, it’s hard for me to say, “Please let him in, let him in” general classes. I’m talking about my position.

Gus’s mother emphasized the value of Gus’s time with typically developing children in his school days. She additionally pointed out that Gus would learn social norms from peer models through inclusive education.

My kid will be alone even when he is grown up. I don’t think he will be with other people as a member of society. He will be alone. If so, the only time when he is not alone but with kids without disabilities is his childhood, schooldays. No chance will be given to him after the period. I wanted him to see how the kids are thinking and what they have, as he is playing with them. He learns, not just be present in the setting. For example, he learns, ‘oh, the friend thinks this way’ ‘This friend should not behave that way under this condition. That friend engages in that behavior.’ Things like that.

Regarding Gus’s peer relationships, the mother described how Gus likes peers.

He loves friends [his peers] very much by his nature. When he had some problems in school, I think he could say he does not want to go to school because of mental fatigue [caused by the problem]. But he easily forgets about it and goes to school the next day because he likes friends.

The meaning of the word “friends” in this excerpt is close to peers, considering that the Korean word ‘friend’ has a meaning of people of the same age, and the excerpt below confirms this meaning. When I asked about Gus’s friendship development skills, the mother said that his friendship would be up to his peers’ understanding of Gus.
This kid [Gus] likes friends [his peers] very much and tries to make a friend, but I think it will be up to how his friends [peers] understand him. If they understand him like he is this kind of kid like a baby, then they would become his friend. If not, they would not be his friend. You know, Gus advanced to high school. He seemed to talk to friends. I heard he was talking to a kid on the phone. So, I asked who he was. Then he said it was his classmate…He looked very happy. You know he has difficulty with speaking. He is not fluent. But I’m not sure if the kid understands this difficulty. Anyhow, Gus talked to him.

Although she noted the influence of peers’ awareness of Gus’s disability on his peer relationships, she did not express any expectation or desire for teachers’ interventions in this area.

Similar to Gus’s mother, Harry’s mother emphasized the value of Harry’s time with typically developing peers in his school days. She also noted that Harry likes being with typically developing children in school.

I think Harry has many opportunities to be with children with disabilities. He is grouped with them here and there. So, it’s only a school and a church where Harry can play with typically developing children. I think Harry likes playing with general kids more than those with disabilities. He seems to know it’s more fun to play with general kids than be in the Help room [special education classroom].

She guessed that Harry is likely to be socially isolated from his typically developing peers despite his desire to play with them.
Because Harry is not the one who has no cognitive ability, he knows that other children don’t want to play with him or want to keep their distance from him. So, he does not actively initiate peer interactions. I think he would feel isolated. When they play in a group, he is just watching how they are playing. Somehow if they let Harry in the group, he plays with them. That’s it.

Harry’s mother said that Harry’s communicational difference would be the main reason for his social isolation. This mother wanted teachers to help typically developing children understand his communication characteristics.

I think it would be ideal that a special education teacher helps my kid play with his peers in his homeroom and let them know my kid’s difficulties. And as you know, our kids need more time to think and talk to them. Because most of the kids without disabilities do not wait until he talks, it’s hard for him to communicate with peers. Kids easily misunderstood Harry’s intention. For this reason, I think Harry gave up talking to peers.

She also described how she asked Harry’s homeroom teacher to prevent conflicts with peers because of his characteristics of communication.

I asked for a consult with Harry’s current homeroom teacher at the beginning of this school year. During the consultation, I told the teacher that other students tended to misunderstand Harry’s intention because he has difficulty expressing his thoughts using language. I then asked the teacher to intervene in this problem. The teacher seemed to understand what I was telling him. I think he watched some incidents relevant to the problem. Although he said, he will carefully watch
Harry regarding this issue; I don’t expect much because the teacher is a male (laughter).

During member checking about eight months later, she updated the improvement of Harry’s peer relationship.

I guess Harry has gentle classmates who have a good personality. When he had to be absent from school for his swimming contest, he always sent a text message to a particular classmate. For example, “I would not be in school. I will participate in a swimming competition today. Do not look for me.” Then, he got a message back from the student, like “I see. Have a good day.” So, I thought he is gradually learning about how to make a friend, and for this kind of thing he needs inclusive education.

As Amy’s mother attributed improvement of Amy’s peer relationships to the good atmosphere in school, Harry’s mother said that Harry gained good peer relationships because his current peers had “a good personality.”

**Deficit-based moral approach to academic supports.** All of the mothers did not expect that their children with ID would make academic outcomes in general education classes. Six mothers predicted off task of their children with ID in these classes. They, however, linked this off task solely to their children’s academic deficits, not a lack of appropriate supports. The mothers also considered potential disadvantages of teachers and the other students when they described desires for inclusive education practices to promote their children’s learning.

Harry’s mother said, “Harry told me he sleeps in [general education] class. He said he sleeps with his chin propped on his hands.” When I talked about curricular
adaptation for his learning in general classes, this mother immediately stated that Harry had received the support for three subject classes in a special education classroom.

Interviewer: I think general or special education teachers could modify goals or learning contents to match Harry’s present level.

Harry’s mother: Oh, I see. Harry has taken major subjects such as Korean language, math, and English classes in that way. Although he could not take every class like that, he studies these three subjects in the help room based on his present level.

When I asked about her desires of teachers’ supports for Harry’s engagement in inclusive classes, she sighed and kept silence for about two seconds. Then, she said, “that’s too ambitious.”

I think that’s too ambitious. If I desire that in this society, I’m too selfish. I think I cannot desire that in this society. How nice it will be as long as it can happen. However, I can’t desire that [support] for my kid… It’s because there are many students in one classroom, and their learning contents got more difficult than before. So, I think it’s hard to teach my kid one by one in general education classrooms.

Although she did not expect inclusive education practices based on her morality considering teachers’ circumstances, she expressed desires for teachers’ support for Harry’s learning.

I think he can make progress in learning if he gets a little help from teachers. I hope teachers help my kid’s learning. I think if he has gotten a teacher’s
assistance rather than mine, he could have made more progress particularly when he was in the lower grades.

She also desired Harry’s academic achievement in inclusive classes.

One day when I got back home from outside, I saw that Harry was grading his exam papers in the living room. I felt funny, but at the same time, I was sad. I felt that this child also wants to get good grades in his exams (weeping). Just like other kids, he knows what’s good grades, he wants to get them, and he might like to boast of what he did well. As I was thinking this, I felt very sad. But I laughed at him outwardly saying, “Why are you grading, boy? It’s in vain,” But seeing what he was doing made me very sad.

Dori’s mother noted that Dori’s off task in general education classes is her “natural responses” because task difficulty makes Dori lose her interests and then fall asleep. She also talked about teachers’ difficulties with Dori’s off-task and viewed separate special education classes as the only way to prevent her off-task, although she did not like the separate classes.

When I asked her teacher, I heard that she sleeps in class. She falls asleep when she loses interest. She has done so since her elementary school. You know, math is hard, and so she sleeps [in math class] … You know, she is doing so not because she wants to do so, but because it is a natural response of her body. But I think teachers might have difficulties. However, I cannot have her stay in the special education classroom for the entire school day.

The following excerpt confirmed that she did not expect general education teachers’ interventions for Dori’s learning in their classes.
Interviewer: What would you want general education teachers to do in class except awaking her when she is sleeping in class?

Dori’s mother: Did you mean general education class teachers?

Interviewer: Yes, something you want them to do other than awaking her.

Dori’s mother: (Sigh) what they could do [for her]? How could they do?

When I provided an example of collaborative teaching between special and general education teachers during an inclusive class, she first described how teachers and the other students would be uncomfortable with the practice. On the other hand, she indicated desires for having that type of supports for Dori.

I think it would be difficult for a special education teacher to be in general education classes because s/he also has special education classes, and their supports could disrupt a general education teacher’s teaching and other kids’ learning. But I think that kind of support would be good for Dori.

Evan’s mother guessed that Evan would be off task in most of the general education classes in current middle school but described some activities in English class.

Teachers just told me that he was okay if there was no problem…When I saw his notebook, there was nothing written in his notebook. In the case of English class, I saw that English words were densely written on two to three pages. You know, I think the [class] level does not fit him, and he does not understand the class. So, I guess teachers give him a direction like ‘write from here to there’, and Evan just followed the direction because he is so mild, and then the teacher checked what he did.
This mother viewed solely writing English words in class as discrimination of access to information, but she expressed that it was better than nothing Evan was doing in class.

I don’t see it negatively because the teacher at least had an intention for Evan to participate in class. But, you know, although it would be helpful for Evan to be seated in class, it is not really helpful for Evan’s learning. He receives a different extent of information from his peers during the class. I feel bad about it, but because there’s no choice in Korea (laughter), I just follow [what teachers do].

“No choice” in this excerpt seemed connected to her compromised position where she put down her desired inclusive education.

…the reason that I can’t give up [inclusive education] is that teachers would not focus only on him even in a special school. It would be good education that he listens to his peer friends and have a meal together with them [through inclusive education]. I guess most of the mothers [of children with disabilities] would think so. They would have the same thought as me. It’s to develop my kid’s sociality that s/he attends [a general education] school, even though eating a meal is the only thing that the kid does in school.

Evan’s mother did not expect his academic development in inclusive classes and rather considered what difficulties teachers would have because of Evan’s academic level.

Some of our kids may need care in the academic area. Whereas, there are kids like Evan who have difficulty with communication and could not receive academic input…what the school could provide for this kid is only [academic] teaching, but this kid could not receive. For this reason, teachers also feel burdened, like how I could do for this kid.
Amy’s mother stated that she “felt relieved” when she saw Amy’s off task in a general education class because most of her classmates were also showing off task.

[All of the students] looked the same when I attended her open class. Only a few of them listened to the teacher, and the rest of the students were off-task. I felt relieved when I saw that. Most of them, except some students, were sleeping putting their heads down on the desk.

She said that she should not expect Amy’s academic development in general education classes because she chose full inclusion for Amy’s educational placement.

I consulted with the teacher regarding full inclusion, and since then, Amy has got full inclusion from her fifth grade. I told the teacher that I don’t desire Amy to study well like general kids. This was the condition that allowed Amy to get full inclusion…the special education teacher told me that Amy could have full inclusion if I don’t want Amy’s academic achievement much.

When I provided an example of instructional adaptation for Amy’s learning in general education classes, she described that the implementation of inclusive education practices would be up to teachers’ benevolence. She subsequently talked about teachers’ difficulties in addressing Amy’s educational needs as the other mothers did.

That would be great. But I think teachers may have difficulties in doing so…I think it requires [the teacher’s] benevolence. The teacher could take care of my kid, but there are other general kids as well. So, I think, that would not be doable for teachers.

Instead, she expressed her desire tied to the condition of full inclusion as she learned.
I hope [inclusive classes] pass by just like water flows...She should not disrupt classes, though. I think it would be okay that she be with peers in class without disrupting it.

Like the other mothers, the mother of Betty and Caesar talked about her children’s off-task in general education classes, deficit-based perspective on the children’s disability, reliance on separate special education classes for the children’s academic progress, no expectation of having inclusive education practices in consideration of teachers’ circumstances (teaching many students at a time), and her hope of the children’s no disruption of general education classes. She said that she taught Caesar how to be in general education classes as below.

I told him, “When a teacher came into your classroom to teach a class, you should be seated, open the textbook, and pretend to see it though you don’t understand it.”

Felicia’s mother indicated her guilty feeling about Felicia’s eligibility for special education. She said, “I’ve been so busy working for a living that I was not able to take care of my kids’ learning. So, both of my kids got it [eligibility for special education].” She heard about special education from one of Felicia’s teachers who first suggested application for the eligibility. This teacher’s introduction of special education seemed to imply that special education is supplemental classes to reduce a gap from the academic norm of typically developing children.

One day, a teacher called and told me that it used to be called ‘special’, but now it is to study in some way... I decided to let her get it after lots of thought because I didn’t want her to become an idiot... I think our Felicia has not yet mastered the
Korean language, although her peers all mastered it. I think she is a little stuttering. She has had that side.

Felicia’s mother did not directly state her consideration of teachers’ circumstances but represented her submission to teachers’ suggestion that was different from her desires. I honestly wanted to leave her to general education teachers from the Korean language through Music and English classes in middle school, though she got one-to-one care in elementary school. It was because I thought she should adjust school and get along with other kids though one-to-one tutoring would be better for her to learn one by one Korean letter. But the homeroom teacher and the special education teacher told me that Felicia needs to learn the Korean language and math in a special education classroom because she has many difficulties with these subjects. They said they will fit everything for Felicia through those classes [in the special education classroom]. So, I just told them that I hope they will do so well.

Both Felicia’s mother and the teachers shared knowledge of great effects of separate special education classes on Felicia’s academic achievement as opposed to low or no expectation of Felicia’s academic progress in inclusive classes. This did not mean that her desires changed because she represented the same desires again at the end of the interview.

Consistent with the other mothers, Gus’s mother talked about her low expectation of Gus’s academic achievement in general education classes because of his low academic level. The data below indicates that both the Korean language teacher and Gus’s mother did not consider Gus’s academic achievement in the class. Gus’s mother stated that
letting Gus be in Korean language class was itself due to the teacher’s kindness because students with disabilities are typically excluded from Korean language classes to study in a special education classroom.

… but my kid’s level is not that good, but I heard that he is social… She [Korean language teacher] said, Gus took her class last year, and it would be okay for Gus to take her class this year as well. Then, I told her, thank you, and so, Gus was naturally able to take the general education Korean classes. As far as I know, schools exclude these students from Korean, English, and math classes [general education core subject classes]. Or they exclude them from Korean language and math classes. The exclusion happens for difficult subject classes, but Gus knows English alphabets a little, and he actively responds to teachers’ directions. So, teachers said, let Gus stay in general education classes. So, to me, it doesn’t matter if Gus takes classes in general or special education classrooms.

Unlike the other mothers, Gus’s mother guessed the level of his active engagement in inclusive classes.

I heard that he participated in the classes very actively. He presented something in class. I guess, teachers give Gus a chance to talk because he so actively responds though his talk is not the answer to their question. (Laughter) Another mother who watched open class told me that Gus looked so happy in class, he participated in class very happily.

She said she was “satisfied with Gus’s current inclusive classes” regardless of his academic achievement.
The moral and deficit-based approach to supports was shown in three mothers’ statements about school activity choices. They said that they did not choose or were not allowed to choose some activity choices universally open to every student. Gus’s mother described that she did not choose Gus’s preferred afterschool program (football program) because of his support needs.

It would be good if they let Gus in the football program, but we, mothers always think our kids might cause inconvenience to them [other students and/or teachers in charge of the program]. (Gus’s mother)

Evan’s mother spoke about her frustrating experiences of registering for extracurricular clubs that she thought Evan would enjoy. She seemed to learn that teachers would not welcome Evan to extracurricular activities because of his support needs.

I surely felt so [when Evan was] in the first grade [in the middle school (7th grade)]. Like playing janggu (Korean traditional instrument) in school. He likes it a lot though he is not good at music. He has a good sense of rhythm, and he is good at playing janggu. I saw that the school has a program for playing samulnori (Korean traditional percussion music including playing janggu). I told his homeroom teacher [that I wanted him to take the program], but the teacher cut the hope, saying that the level of the club activity is very high. Then, Evan is very good at jumping rope. (Laughter). I found that the school has a club for jumping rope. But the teacher rejected [my desire for him to join the club] again. So, I finally asked the teacher, ‘What should Evan do for a club activity?’ The teacher answered a club that the teacher teaches. This means that the teacher will take care of Evan. (Evan’s mother)
Similarly, Dori’s mother stated that a teacher frustrated her choice of Dori’s preferred activity. Unlike Evan’s mother, Dori’s mother did not criticize the teacher’s refusal of her choice but accepted the teacher’s reason for the refusal (Dori’s skill deficits).

When Dori was in first grade (7th grade) in this school, I wanted her to join the school choir. I didn’t know that this school choir is well-known at that time. I just told her homeroom teacher who was the music teacher that Dori would register the school choir because she likes singing. The homeroom teacher said that Dori could not join the choir because the choir students should be able to respond quickly to unexpected occasions.

The mother-held concerns about the child’s adult life. The mothers privately held concerns about their children’s adult life without expecting a school’s support. They seemed to perceive that schools do not care about their children’s life after graduation, and it would be their responsibility to take care of the children’s adult life. Gus’s mother elaborated on this issue.

… baby birds leave their nests when they master flying skills as they try to flutter by themselves. Their parents just need to be there. Then the birds will visit the nest as a place to rest. But these kids are not like those birds. They might get a job, but how long could they maintain the employment? That is my greatest concern. I think this kid can do something well that somebody commanded him to do, but I don’t think the job could be sustainable. My conclusion is ‘home’ again. Home. We again.

She was also concerned that the expense and effort she has invested for Gus might be for naught after his graduation.
I have told, I’ve brought him up spending a lot of money, like the amount of college tuition, since his early childhood to make him function this much. I have not done this for him just to be confined at home.

Evan’s mother had a similar concern.

When our kids become adults, there are even fewer places where they could go… their development retrogresses as they stay only at home and continuously have a boring time with a mother. Then, all of the mothers’ efforts for the past 18 years become meaningless. They retrogress because they don’t have any places to go to.

Felicia’s mother was concerned about Felicia’s independent use of a bus.

Our Felicia cannot use a bus well. She uses a bus in the morning when she’s going to school, but she can’t take a bus on her way back home from school. Let’s say she finished school at 2. Then, she calls the pastor of the vision school to ask for a ride. I think she needs to learn how to take a bus regardless of going to a high school far away from or close to home. She cannot be under parents’ protection forever. So, I told her to take a bus without calling the pastor after school. I told her, find a bus stop for getting our village. I told her when you could not take a bus even after trying this and that, then call mom. But she didn’t want to do it on her own because she is afraid.

Amy’s mother described her efforts to seek out Amy’s future job. Like the other mothers, she did not expect that a school help Amy explore future jobs.

As I said, Amy likes cooking. She cooked for her brother just right before [I came here]. They help each other. I asked her, “Amy, I will help you learn what you want to learn. Do you like to learn nail art?” You know many people get nail [art
services] these days. There are many nail art shops, as well. So, I asked her if she wants to learn nail [art]. But she said, “No.” Then I asked her again, “Do you like to learn makeup?” Again, “No.” She told me that she liked cooking. She wanted to be a cook before we moved to this city. So, I asked her, “Do you want to go to learn cooking for your hobby?” Then she said, “I don’t know. I’ll think about it.” Then she didn’t talk about it anymore. I asked, “What do you like doing now?” She said that she wants to be an athlete…I think she is thinking about Taekwondo [for her future job]. She used to say she like cooking, and so, I tried to find a private cooking center. But I think her interest obviously turned to Taekwondo.

Similarly, Dori’s mother was concerned about Dori’s future job, saying, “I’m actually not sure yet about which work my daughter would do for her living. I have no idea about it.” While the other mothers did not expect a school to do something for these concerns, Dori’s mother expressed her desire for the school to provide helpful activities for Dori’s future job. During member checking, she confirmed her desire that the school provides Dori-preferred activities to help her ready for a future job.

**Culture-Based Advocacy for Inclusive Education**

The mothers overall did not know about legal protections for inclusive education. Although some of them stated related laws, they did not place a practical value on the laws for their advocacy for their children with ID. Instead, these mothers commonly specified culture-based advocacy for the children’s inclusive education.

**Low practical value of legal tools.** Regarding legal tools for the children’s inclusive education, five mothers did not state specific laws. They said, “I never heard about the laws” (Amy’s mother), “I do not know the laws” (Dori’s mother), “It is
difficult” (the mother of Betty and Caesar), “are there any laws for it [inclusive education]? (Felicia’s mother), or “I do not know well about laws.” (Gus’s mother). Harry’s and Evan’s mothers stated some laws for inclusive education, but they did not place practical values on laws. Harry’s mother described legal protection for inclusive education for children with a disability.

I heard from parent training one time that inclusive education is mandatory … I can’t tell you exactly what it is, but I know that students with special needs have the right to attend inclusive school. It’s not right that they must go to special schools. Laws protect this.

She, however, additionally said, “I felt teachers didn’t like parents’ demands using a law.” She did not fully trust legal protections for children with disabilities.

But a law is a law. When things happen in the real world, they are not always addressed by the law. As far as I know, many things are unfavorable to us. Despite her negative view of legal protections, she acknowledged that parent organizations would advocate for rights of children with disabilities.

Korean people all would feel this way [about laws]. Laws protect people with power. We could not change anything even if we speak up, because we are powerless. Even so, it is grateful that we have organized institutions like a parent organization because they stand for us.

Evan’s mother stated the title of the Korean special education law and the anti-discrimination statute.

I know that our kids should not be discriminated. And general kids would have heavier punishment when they make some problems for our kids like bullying. I
mean students will have heavier punishment when they bully kids with disabilities than they do typically developing kids. It includes discrimination like excluding them from a class or group activities like a field trip.

She also specified how to use laws through her parent organization.

We have done collective work. When mothers faced troubles [with their children’s school], they can have a lawyer consultation through the parent organization. They can just ask the organization when their children get disadvantaged by the school. The lawyer would check if the school has any policy relevant to the issue and let them know legal rights…parent training provided by the organization mostly had a form of leisure activities for mothers because caring for our kids is strenuous. Also, when some laws are amended, the organization holds a briefing session on the amendment.

She, on the other hand, noted greater power of teacher authority over laws.

For example, a teacher of technology and home economics tells a homeroom teacher of a student with disabilities that s/he have difficulty in class because the student makes noises. If so, the mother may request that a teacher assistant be in the class to support the student with disability and would tell how this student could spend all the time in the special education classroom. Even after the mother tells so, if the teacher says, ‘I don’t want a teacher assistant to come in my class,’ then the student should move to a special education classroom for the class…there’s an IEP that law stipulated. It determines the time when the student with disabilities study in a special education classroom and then for the rest of the
time, the student stays in a general education classroom. But I think it is not observed well because of teachers’ educational authority.

When I asked if she thinks mothers just follow whatever teachers tell them to do, she said, “yes, not to make the matter bigger. It will be okay if only I keep quiet.” This seems to indicate that Evan’s mother knew the greater power of cultural contexts over legal protections as Harry’s mother did. Gus’s mother had the same perspective on laws. She said, “Even though a law changes, schools would bypass the law. There are a lot of schools that do what they want, bypassing laws. I don’t think they do so because of no [relevant] law.”

**Common use of cultural tools.** The mothers commonly described cultural advocacy tools for their children with ID. These tools included appealing to teachers, pleasing teachers, and using a hierarchy in the public school system. First, four mothers wanted to obtain teachers’ virtuous practices by appealing to the teachers. Gus’s mother emphasized the importance of appealing to teachers.

I think education for students without disabilities occurs just naturally. Today, most of the schools even academic high schools have special education and inclusive education. However, I think they are actually not appropriate for our kids. For example, they don’t have benevolence-based systems like afterschool programs for kids with disabilities to join with other students without disabilities. I think schools focus on the needs of the majority of the students, not our kids’ needs. But if we want the things that they made for the majority, we should cry out for them. Then we might have to gain them. It’s like people give one more
rice cake to a crying baby [Korean idiom that is equivalent to the American idiom, “a squeaky wheel gets the grease”].

Evan’s mother described a strategy that she developed to help teachers address Evan’s behavior appropriately, appealing to their empathy and virtue.

I have given written information to them [teachers]. [I wrote] he is sensitive to sound, but his response to sound is not serious. They then would understand Evan’s problem behavior. They would think this kid does so because he is sensitive to sound…This is very important, and I think teachers’ response [to the letter] was the best. Teachers seemed to understand my kid from the parent perspective and feel how I’m desperate. I always wrote ‘Please don’t think that it is mom’s selfish desire that I send him to the general education school. Because inclusive education is very important for Evan, he attends the school despite the fact that both he and I would have a hard time. So, please understand and excuse me’ at the end of the letter.

Harry’s mother appealed to a special education teacher in middle school when Harry was about to graduate from elementary school in order to gain appropriate support.

I went to middle school where Harry was supposed to be placed. I told the teacher that Harry did not benefit from the Help room in elementary school because the special education teacher there focused only on two students with severe disabilities. Then I told her that they would enter this school because this school is close to their home, but I really don’t want to experience the same disadvantages in middle school; I want my kid to learn in this Help room and get your care.
Felicia’s mother said that she would visit the school and appeal to teachers if they command Felicia to transfer to a special school on the basis of her disability.

Felicia’s mother: I want to beg the school staff [for keeping her at this school].

You know there would be one [teachers’ room] for 1st grade, 2nd grade, and 3rd grade in each floor.

Interviewer: Do you think you would like to appeal to teachers?

Felicia’s mother: Yes.

Second, three mothers wanted to please teachers because they expected teachers to treat their children with ID well if they do so. The mother of Betty and Caesar said that she tried to attend school events to please teachers for her children’s good school life.

I should attend this kind of event so that teachers would treat my kids well.

(Laughter). I mean they are more likely to take care of my kids well and call me when something bad happens to the kids. They would not care about my kids if I don’t participate in school events. So, I should do it.

When I asked if she called teachers to know her children’s school life, she said, “I did to ask about something, but you know, teachers do not like parents who often call them.” She said that she tried not to call teachers in consideration of teachers’ feelings. Harry’s mother showed a similar thought.

And, you know, I think teachers don’t like mothers who talk a lot to them.

Mothers try not to request something to them because we know that. If we have two things to request, we just tell them one. Even if we want to tell them 100 words, we just say one word. It’s because we are concerned, what if my kid gets disadvantaged by teachers after I complain about something to them? …I try not
to ask teachers even if I want to speak up and tell them to treat my kid equally.

It’s because I’m concerned that my kid may get a disadvantage if I bother them.

Gus’s mother described a gap between mothers’ behaviors before and behind a school principal in consideration of the principal’s feeling.

We have a new principal this year…He asked us if we could give a ride to students when the number of vehicles is insufficient for field trips. I’m not sure about his intention. It could be good or bad, but I told him that I’m willing to do that anytime just to make him happy because I knew that it’s not going to happen.

I’m the only one who has a car among the mothers… Although the principal talked to us nicely about it, we, the mothers didn’t talk about it nicely behind him…Behind him, we all talked about how important training public transportation is for our kids.

Third, three mothers talked about advocacy using a high authority or the hierarchy of the public school system to protect their children’s rights. They expected that teachers would take defensive actions if they use this strategy. The mother of Betty and Caesar said that she would stand against the school’s discrimination using a hierarchy in the public school system.

Interviewer: What would you do if the school notifies you, “Betty cannot participate in a field trip because she has a disability”?

Betty’s mother: I will go and talk to them.

Interviewer: Who would you talk to?

Betty’s mother: I will talk to the vice principal or the principal.

Interviewer: Who would you first talk to?
Betty’s mother: I think, a teacher because I feel a little uncomfortable with the vice principal and the principal.

Interviewer: Which teacher would you like to talk to first?

Betty’s mother: I would go and talk to the special education teacher because she taught Betty for a year.

Interviewer: If it did not work, who would you like to go and talk to?

Betty’s mother: I would go to a higher one like city hall.

Betty’s mother seemed to mean a local educational agency by city hall. Similarly, Amy’s mother wanted to use a hierarchy of the public school system to protect Amy’s equal right.

Interviewer: What would you do if a school excludes Amy from some activities for the reason of her disability?

Amy’s mother: I first ask the homeroom teacher and the special education teacher why they do so. If it does not work, I then go to higher authorities like the school principal. If it does not work, I will go and talk to the local educational agency.

Harry’s mother also wanted to use a hierarchy in the public school system to protect Harry from victimization of school violence. She said, “if somebody hurt Harry in middle school, we would meet the school principal or directly go and talk to the local school agency to make the issue big.”

Gus’s mother talked about three incidents relevant to violation of the anti-discrimination law by excluding Gus from school activities based on his disability. She described how she protected Gus’s legal rights using her cultural tools. The following excerpt presents one of the three incidents.
This school has a two-night field trip for students in second grade (8th grade). When my kid was in that grade, I got a long text message from the Help room teacher. She gave us three options. The first one was to send all students with disabilities from first to third grade (from 7th grade to 9th grade) to one-day field trips during the period of other kids’ field trip. I don’t remember the second one. And then the third one was to send students with disabilities to the field trip that other students [without a disability] are supposed to go. I just called the teacher as soon as I saw the message… And then asked her, “Does this mean that the school won’t bring students with disabilities to the field trip? Did the school authorities tell you that?” Then she told me that they seemed unwilling to bring the students to the field trip.

She said that she used advice of another mother who successfully addressed a similar incident.

The method she learned was to collectively challenge the school’s implicit decision with mothers of the other students with disabilities.

So, I told her [special education teacher], “I would send my kid to the field trip just like the other kids [students without disabilities]. If the school needed something for Gus to attend the trip, I think you could ask for help from the local educational agency…Then I called mothers of the other three students with disabilities in the second grade (8th grade) and then asked them if they got the same text message…I said, I told the Help room teacher this and that and then asked her to tell the school what I told her. I said to the mothers, “Don’t take a step back. If we all say the same thing, they will open a meeting. Unpleasant
things are theirs, not ours.” All the mothers cooperated with me. Then, about two days later, I heard (from the Help classroom teacher) that the school would have a meeting for that…Then the next day, she called me and said that the school decided to bring all the students on the trip.

She said the school decided to bring more teachers to the field trip to give supports to students with disabilities after the mothers’ collective challenges.

Dori’s mother did not want to challenge Dori’s school but wanted to follow the school’s decision.

Interviewer: What would you do if the school tells you that Dori should study only in the special education classroom because she does not follow but disrupt class activities?

Dori’s mother: Then there would be no choice. She should stay only in the special education classroom.

**Desired laws for better school contexts.** The mothers commonly desired laws to improve school contexts such as a sufficient number of licensed special education teachers, rigorous teacher training, and rigorous disability awareness education. Four mothers wanted laws to ensure the placement of a special education teacher in each school.

I really want to mandate the installation of a special education classroom in each school just like a company should unconditionally hire a certain percentage of people with disabilities. Just unconditionally. The number of special education classrooms gets gradually insufficient as kids advance to upper levels of school. I
hope that there should be more than two special education classrooms in each middle school and high school.

Evan’s mother said “installation of a special education classroom,” but I viewed it as mandatory placement of special education teachers rather than physical classrooms because the other data indicated that she focused on a special education teacher’s role when she talked about the number of special education classrooms. For example, she said, “The school should install one more [special education] classroom if the number of students [with disabilities] is nine or more. But I heard that a special education teacher teaches nine students.” Dori’s mother similarly pointed out an insufficient number of special education teachers.

One special education teacher is in charge of too many students [with disabilities].

There are only two [special education] teachers in the school, but I guess the number of students [with disabilities] is almost 20. Then, one teacher should be in charge of 10 students. I think it would be difficult.

Harry’s mother said that Harry was disadvantaged because a special education teacher had too many cases, and Harry’s support needs are less than students with severe disabilities.

If there are four students with disabilities in a special education classroom without a paraprofessional, guess, who is the special education teacher taking care of? Of course, it would be students with severe disabilities. She would not take care of students with borderline disabilities like Harry, would she? This is the real world. I heard from one parent of a student with disabilities during parent training that our kids are discriminated not by kids without disabilities but kids with
disabilities. I really agree with that, especially for kids with borderline disabilities. If parents of students with borderline disabilities keep asking for help for their kids, help room teachers would hate that.

Gus’s mother noted that non-licensed special education teacher did not have enough power to stand for Gus’s right. For this reason, she wanted to have a law that enables each school to have a licensed special education teacher.

I have talked with my husband as we went through difficulties in school. It was that we need a licensed special education teacher. Why? … I had licensed teachers [a licensed special education teacher] in elementary school but never met a licensed teacher in middle school…The school authorities don’t listen to temporary teachers. Temporary [special education] teachers cannot speak up for our kids because they’re concerned that they might get fired if they speak against school authorities.

Amy’s and Gus’s mothers wanted to have a law that strengthens general education teachers’ training about special education. Evan’s mother did not state that she wanted to have this law, but she noted some problems with current teacher training.

I know that general education teachers should get 60-hour training to be a homeroom teacher for kids like Evan. But I heard that the training is like they just keep their computer on and push the Next button. So, general education teachers still see intellectual disability as low IQ and students with autism as those showing many problem behaviors because they don’t know exactly about their characteristics.
Gus’s mother described a similar problem with current teacher training and expressed a desire that the relevant law should change to strengthen the training.

I hope [the school staff] would understand our kids at least a little more. You know, principals, vice-principals, director teachers, and headteachers have education for understanding disabilities if their school has our kids (students with disabilities). I wonder if they truly learn about our kids or just superficially take the education… I think they miss that chance to understand our kids because education is taken superficially. So, they just don’t know about our kids… I think, if they miss even that education, they would never know about our kids. I hope, at least they get trained with that education mandatorily and precisely. I hope the relevant law is revised.

Amy’s mother presented an example of how to strengthen general education teachers’ training.

I hope not only special education teachers but general education teachers know special education. If so, they could support kids with disabilities when special education teachers are absent. When I was getting training in following fire-fighting procedures, I took 3-day lessons and then took an exam on the final day. I think the general education teachers’ training should include an exam after getting some training.

Evan’s mother desired a law that enables typically developing children to receive rigorous disability awareness education. She did not know about the current law that mandates disability awareness law. When I talked to her about the relevant law, she desired that the law would be strengthened to improve disability awareness education.
Aha, so, it was the reason that the school gives papers. I want the education becomes strengthened. I hope a special education teacher delivers the education rather than provides just papers… I hope that a special education teacher figures out problem behavior, strengths, non-preferred things, and something, like this behavior, has this meaning through parent consultation before the education [of disability awareness] and then informs students in all classrooms about these. It’s because they could meet this kid next year in class. I hope education is mandatorily delivered in this way.

Harry’s mother did not directly express a desire for this law, but she pointed out the limited effectiveness of current disability awareness education.

She seemed to educate the students using some resources such as characteristics of a child with intellectual disability. Although I don’t know exactly what it was because I didn’t see it, the teacher told me so…Children these days are so astute that they pretend to understand Harry’s disability in the presence of teachers, but they are not considerate of his disability when they’re playing with Harry.

In summary, the results of this research indicated that the participants knew that teachers communicate with them in response to their initiation of the communication for protection of the children with ID in school. These mothers commonly desired teacher-initiated communication that allows them to know about their children’s school life and professionally teaches them appropriate ways to support the children. They longed for social development of their children with ID through inclusive education, but they were commonly concerned about possible difficulties of teachers and typically developing students when I asked about their desires for inclusive education practices. Similarly,
they made a moral approach to academic supports for these children’s academic progress in inclusive settings considering their children’s ID as personal deficits. The mothers also privately held concerns about these children’s adult lives without expecting school interventions. They commonly talked about using culture-based ways to advocate for their children’s inclusive education (e.g., appealing to teachers’ virtue, using the hierarchy of the school system) rather than laws. Although they did not currently use laws for their personal advocacy, they desired laws to improve school contexts for their children’s inclusive education (e.g., mandatory of rigorous teacher training in special education).

V. Discussion

I explored knowledge and desires of seven mothers of children with ID in South Korea regarding inclusive education practices and laws. I expected to find specific laws and practices that these participants knew and wanted to have. This research, however, indicated that the mothers’ approach to social justice, disability, education, and advocacy was consistent with Confucianism which does not provide the same justification for inclusive education as the Western theories. This could be understood in the South Korean context where Confucianism has a long history (over 1000 years), and people still hold Confucian values consciously or unconsciously (Chin, 2018; Kang-Nyeong Kim, 2009; Śleziak, 2013; Y. B. Zhang et al., 2005).

In addition, inclusive education in South Korea began with the national policy that its government adopted in step with the Western trend toward the inclusion of people with disabilities (Yong-Wook Kim, 2013, 2014; Jung, 2017; J. Ryu, 2013). The inclusive education law was not the outcome of a parent advocacy effort against separate education
for children with disabilities. Therefore, people in South Korea might encounter the inclusive education policy without a paradigm that justifies inclusive education. This research seems to show one case of South Korean mothers of middle school students with ID who used a cultural paradigm (Confucianism) for inclusive education. I discuss the mothers’ expectations of teachers’ protection for their children with ID prior to the discussion of my research questions.

**The Mothers’ Extension of Their Protection Role to Teachers**

Protection from school violence was the mothers’ common concern. This finding confirms that parents of middle school students with ID are concerned about peer teasing in inclusive schools (Suk-Hang Lee & Ahn, 2011; W. Lee & Kwak, 2014; Palmer et al, 1998b). The MOE (2019) recently surveyed 90.7% students in South Korea ($n = \approx 3,720,000$) and reported that 3.6%, 0.8%, and 0.4% of the students in elementary, middle, and high schools, respectively, experienced bullying victimization. Given these small percentages across different levels of schools, school bullying might not be a highly prevalent serious issue in South Korea. Students with disabilities, however, might be more vulnerable to bullying than those without disabilities. For example, Yoon, Choi, and Kim (2011) noted that 12% of the students in elementary, middle, and high schools in South Korea ($n = 9,297$) reported their experience of bullying or teasing students with disabilities. Samsup Kim (2016) found that 36% of his survey participants ($n = 1,606$; special education teachers, general education teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents) had experience with bullying victimization of students with disabilities in inclusive education settings, but most of them did not appropriately
handle those victimization incidents. Y. Kang and Kong (2014) indicated that having a disability itself is likely to increase the vulnerability to bullying in South Korea.

Communication with teachers was these mothers’ strategy to protect their children with ID in school. Given that communication conveys the communicator’s culture (Hirokawa & Miyahara, 1986), the mothers appeared to indicate their cultural expectation of teachers through their communication with teachers. Specifically, the mothers seemed to have a Confucian perspective on schools. They appeared to view society as an extension of a family (Jeong-Kyu Lee, 2001). The mothers reported a suspicious incident of school violence to teachers expecting teachers’ care for their children and reprimands for students who hurt the children. This seemed to mirror how parents address conflicts between their children (e.g., fighting between older and younger children) rather than a professional approach (e.g., behavioral interventions, self-advocacy instruction, school discipline process). In other words, it appeared that the mothers expect teachers to protect their children as the mothers do at home.

General trust in teachers was another Confucian value that the mothers showed. Trust is one of the Confucian moral virtues (D. Zhang, 2002). Teachers are expected to have a high level of morality and gain public respect in a Confucian society (Li, 2012). Y. J. Cho and colleagues (2010) noted that collectivistic values in Confucianism (e.g., conformity, obedience) were correlated with trust in professionals. Given this, the mothers’ general trust in teachers appeared to be related to their Confucian approach to teachers.

The frustration of the mothers’ general trust in teachers led to their use of more intense ways of asking for teachers’ protection. The mothers who experienced this
frustration challenged teachers using an institution with higher authority than school (police station) or appealing to teachers’ empathy in person instead of using a telephone. These strategies were consistent with Confucian advocacy that involves employing a social hierarchy and appealing to a relevant person’s affection and benevolence (Dong-chun Kim, 2002; Donghee Lee, 2005).

It was notable that the mothers who expressed frustration in their general trust in teachers developed their own strategies to protect their children with ID in school. Interestingly, these mothers all were members of a parent organization for children with disabilities, but none of them stated that they brought the issues to the organization. Even within a family, these mothers said that they are the person in charge of primarily and mostly dealing with school issues of their children with ID, although they do discuss some issues with their husbands. Although this was not different from the other four mothers who continuously trusted teachers, only the mothers whose trust in teachers was frustrated seemed to fight, more intensely but alone, for their children’s safety in school.

The mothers’ primary responsibility for their children is consistent with the Confucian ethics in husband-wife relationships that are based on husbands’ superiority (I. H. Park & Cho, 1995; Oldstone-Moore, 2002). The ethics of motherhood have a long history in Korea from the dissemination of Samganghaensildo in 1434 until now (Eun-hee Lee & Yang, 2017). Although South Korean wives were recently reported to use power equivalent to husbands’ authority (Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism, 2016), it did not change in South Korea that wives have a primary responsibility for caregiving (Seungju Lee & Lee, 2017; Jong-sik Park, 2013; You & McGraw, 2011). This seems to be the reason that all participants for this research were mothers although I
recruited parents, not specifically mothers. In sum, it appeared that the mothers viewed child protection as their primary role in a family and expected teachers to play the same role in a school.

Taken together, the mothers seemed to view their relationships with teachers as Confucian virtue-based relationships to which family relationships extended. They expected teachers to protect their children with ID in school as the mothers do at home. They, however, did not demand teachers’ assurance of the children’s right to safety in school and appropriate behavioral interventions. These mothers reminded teachers of their protection role by talking about a suspicious incident of school violence with general trust in teachers without a request for a specific practice. I viewed this virtue-based relationship with teachers as an indication of the mothers’ extension of family ethics to school. Chan (1999) characterized the virtuous relationship as a relationship based on “caring and loving” (p. 220). This characteristic is consistent with what the mothers expected teachers to do for their children with ID in school.

Knowledge of Inclusive Education Laws

The mothers noted that they neither knew about inclusive education laws nor valued the laws. It appeared, however, that most of the mothers knew of the existence of the laws for their children’s inclusive education, but did not know the details. They might not have cared about the laws and/or never had an opportunity to learn the laws. The mothers who talked about some of the laws subsequently noted that practically speaking, they placed low value on the laws for their advocacy. This might be understandable based on their perception of virtuous relationships with teachers. People in this type of relationship are more likely to appeal to the counterpart’s virtues such as affection and
benevolence rather than demanding legal duties when they face a conflict (Chan, 1999; Dong-chun Kim, 2002; Donghee Lee, 2005). Given that this was consistent with the mothers’ advocacy strategies, it appears that the mothers were not interested in inclusive education laws because they did not consider teachers’ legal obligations for their children with ID. As noted by Chan (1999), it might be inappropriate to use legal rights in virtuous relationships. In a larger context, Confucianism in South Korea, the mothers seemed to believe that teachers’ performance of moral duties outweighs legal protection for their children with ID (Chin, 2018; Dong-chun Kim, 2002).

The mothers expressed their strong will to actively advocate for physical integration and against discrimination of their children with ID, but they did not seem to advocate for inclusive education practices. Interestingly, their advocacy areas were consistent with the South Korean laws for inclusive education. The ASED has sections for physical integration (Chapter 1 Article 2-6) and antidiscrimination of students with ID (Chapter 1 Article 4). The ASED, however, did not have specific sections that require provision of inclusive education practices necessary for students with disabilities to make academic progress in inclusive classes. Furthermore, the legal requirements of an IEP did not include a plan for access to the general curriculum. Chapter 1 Article 21-2 of the ASED states that principals of inclusive schools should establish and implement an inclusive education plan that consists of curriculum modification, a provision of assistants and assistive devices for learning, and teacher training. The curriculum modification, however, is not necessarily made for access to the general curriculum. This is because the Enforcement Rules of the ASED Article 3-2-4 suggested a basic
(alternative) curriculum for students with disabilities who have difficulty in following the general curriculum.

In short, while the mothers actively advocated for physical integration and antidiscrimination, they did not show active advocacy for inclusive education practices. Kuhn (1962) noted that a community’s shared paradigm provides a basis of its rules. A paradigm is defined as “a set of basic beliefs” that produces principles (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 107). Therefore, the consistency between South Korean laws for inclusive education and the mothers’ advocacy seems to raise a question of whether a dominant belief of inclusive education in South Korea justifies only physical integration and antidiscrimination of students with disabilities, but does not provide justification for inclusive education practices. I suggest that future research examine a dominant paradigm of inclusive education with a greater number of people in South Korea.

Confucian Knowledge of Inclusive Education Practices

The mothers’ knowledge of inclusive education practices was based on the Confucian approach to disability, education, social justice, and morality. This knowledge seemed to suppress their advocacy for inclusive education practices.

**Confucian approach to disability and education.** The mothers had low expectations for social and academic development of their children with ID in school for the reason that the children had limitations in intellectual and social functioning. This finding indicates these mothers’ deficit-based perspective on disability, viewing disability as personal deficits rather than interactions between the children and environments that restrict the children’s benefits equivalent to the other students. Also, disability itself is disharmony (He as cited by Y. Zhang & Rosen, 2018) and a cause of disharmony on the
basis of Confucianism (Holroyd, 2003). Given that harmony is the ideal of Confucianism, the Confucian perspective on disability seems to marginalize children with disabilities and their families. Y. Zhang and Rosen (2018) stated that people with disabilities are in an inferior status that needs benevolence of those in superior status in a Confucian society. In other words, this Confucian approach to disability does not justify either self-advocacy of children with ID or advocacy by their parents for their equal rights to educational benefits.

The mothers seemed to have the Confucian meritocratic approach to education with the Confucian perspective on disability. The meritocratic approach takes for granted that students gain unequal achievement depending on personal effort and innate talents (Brighouse as cited by Calvert, 2015). Confucius stated that “the very wise and very stupid never change” (Analects 17:3 translated by Li, 2012, p. 298). This meritocratic approach denies each individual’s different support needs because low achievement is attributed to the individual’s innate talent and low effort. This approach is consistent with the mothers’ attribution of their children’s low social and academic development in school to the children’s academic and social deficits. Combined with the Confucian perspective on disability, the mothers of children with ID seemed to naturally accept the children’s low achievement although they hoped for the children’s academic and social development in school. This might be because the Confucian approach to disability and education does not justify teachers’ provision of additional supports for children with ID to make progress in inclusive classes.

This Confucian approach to disability and education is contrasted to the social model of disability. The social model supports inclusive education because it defines
disability as a result of interactions between individuals with impairments and a society that prevents them from participating in and contributing to the society “on an equal basis with others” (Manago et al., 2017; U.N., 2006, p. 1). This model endows a society with the responsibility for improving its capacity to enable those with disabilities to take a full and critical part in it. The Confucian approach to disability and education, however, does not consider a society’s responsibility for people with disabilities. Instead, the Confucian approach encourages a society’s benevolence for those with disabilities (S. Q. Xu et al., 2018). The benevolence-based approach to education is less likely to ensure consistent professional effort (e.g., using effective teaching strategies; S. Q. Xu et al., 2018) because benevolence is dependent on an individual’s choice, not a legal obligation. Furthermore, this approach is more likely to focus on students’ deficits rather than strengths and preferences (Bak, 1999).

The Confucian deficit-based approach to disability, on the other hand, justifies separate special education. While the social model of disability views separate education for students with disabilities as “a product of society’s inability, unwillingness, or neglect to remove environmental barriers encountered by those with disabilities,” the deficit-based approach views separate education as an effective way of fixing those students’ deficits from the norm (Haegele & Hodge, 2016, p. 197; Manago et al., 2017). This might be the reason that South Korea uses pull-out special education as supports for the academic development of children with disabilities in inclusive schools. Felicia’s mother and Amy’s mother particularly talked about this conflict and their choice of the children’s pull-out separate education for the children’s academic achievement.
As I discussed in my theoretical framework, the South Korean special education law for inclusive education is based on the deficit-based perspective on disability. It is interesting that the legal definition of inclusive education is based on this deficit perspective although inclusive education generally is justified by the social model of disability. The South Korean legal definition included equal access to general education classes but did not require a provision of supports necessary for students with disabilities to make progress in those classes (inclusive education practices). This definition of inclusive education focused on these students’ disability type and severity to determine the appropriateness of education for these children. None of the laws specifically ensured a legal right of children with disabilities to inclusive education practices for the outcome of access to the general curriculum. In this national context, it seems understandable that the mothers settled for physical integration and pull-out special education, although they longed for their children’s full inclusion and genuine belonging.

It appeared that the mothers also used the Confucian approach to disability and education when they were concerned about adult lives of their children with ID. They did not seem to expect schools’ responsibility for preparing these children for adult lives. Instead, they held the concern as a private responsibility and did not envision the children’s lives as valued members of society. This is contrasted to Fisher et al.’s study (1998) reporting that parents of secondary students with ID in the US were concerned about balanced education between community-based instruction (instructions on functional skills) and general education classes. According to the ASED Chapter 1 Article 2-9, secondary students with ID should have education for future jobs and independent living skills. Furthermore, South Korea recently enacted laws for lifelong
education for adults with disabilities in 2016. These laws strengthen the national responsibility for the lives of adults with disabilities (J. Kim, 2018; Doo-Young Kim, Park & Jung, 2016). I suggest that future research examine how parents of middle school students with ID perceive these legal protections for their children’s adult lives.

Confucian knowledge of social justice and morality. The mothers seemed to consider Confucian justice when they were asked about their desires for inclusive education practices. As noted by Murphy and Weber (2016), Confucian justice is defined as social harmony rather than fairness. Confucian justice pursues “the collective good” (Li, 2008, p. 433). This is also consistent with the collectivistic culture in South Korea. Collectivism is a cultural pattern that prioritizes a group’s goal over an individual’s goal (Triandis et al., 1988). The priority of a group’s goal might sacrifice some members’ interests. As noted by Ho (2017), Confucianism values an individual’s sacrifice for social harmony. People in Confucian society are likely to willingly suppress their personal desires for benefits of their group (S. K. Choi & Kim as cited by Haight et al., 2016). This is consistent with the mothers’ suppression of the desires for inclusive education practices necessary to benefit their children with ID in inclusive classes, although they wanted to have those practices if possible. They were concerned about possible disadvantages of the other students (e.g., disruption of their learning) and teachers’ difficulty in teaching many students at a time.

While Confucian justice values these mothers’ suppression of the desires and does not justify advocacy for inclusive education practices, Rawls’s justice supports the necessity of providing inclusive education practices. Rawls’s justice is defined as fairness and pursues benefits of all members of the society (Rawls, 1999). He contended that
every member has inviolability that no one can invade even for all other people’s good. Furthermore, Rawls’s second principle of justice particularly rationalizes unequal distribution of resources to equally benefit all members. In short, Rawls’s theory of justice would justify the mothers’ advocacy for inclusive education practices for children with ID to gain benefits equally to the other students in inclusive school settings rather than merely being present in those settings. Considering that people are likely to change their paradigm when they find a better one (Kuhn, 1962), it seems necessary that the mothers learn about Rawls’s theory of justice and the social model of disability to advocate for inclusive education practices.

The mothers’ paradox. It might be seen as a paradox that the mothers chose to place their children with ID in general education classrooms while not wanting to demand inclusive education practices to avoid possible disadvantages to teachers and the other students. If they had consistently applied this reason (avoidance of possible disadvantages to others) to the placement of their children, it seems they should have chosen separate special schools rather than general education schools. But their choices are understandable (wanting their children with ID to be included in typically developing children groups which are the main groups of the school society, considering the dominant collectivistic culture in South Korea (H. Park et al., 2005). The tension is apparent; attaining this desire (choosing inclusive education), seems to conflict with the mothers’ moral reasons for not asking for inclusive education practices.

This might be relevant to the mothers’ risk-taking following their decision. Risk-taking refers to engagement in behaviors that might cause aversive consequences (Boyer, 2006). The mothers might weigh possible risks related to their demands of the children’s
inclusion in general education classrooms (physical integration) and their requests for appropriate inclusive education practices for academic and social development in the classrooms. Parents of children with disabilities in South Korea are given an opportunity to choose educational placement (general education schools, special schools) when the children advance to upper levels of schools (ASED Article 17-2). At this time parents’ decision of educational placement is delivered to teachers in schools where children with ID are supposed to graduate soon. Unlike decision of educational placement, parents are not given a formal opportunity to request provision of inclusive education practices. If they want to have these practices, they should create a chance to tell teachers to implement appropriate inclusive education practices. Furthermore, this request is related to current teachers’ practices, and thus, parents are more likely to be concerned about aversive consequences that could be produced by the teachers’ negative responses to their demands (e.g., emotional reaction, indifference or neglect of their children, gossiping about them). This indicates that the mothers might not want to demand inclusive education practices not merely because of their sense of righteousness drawn from the Confucian justice (harmony) but because of their fear of possible risks. I suggest that future research explores fear of parents of children with ID regarding their advocacy for inclusive education.

Mother-Desired Practices and Laws for Harmonious Inclusive Education

The mothers commonly desired that their children with ID enjoy the membership of a peer group in inclusive classrooms. This desire seems universal regardless of cultures. Ryndak and colleagues (1995) reported that parents of students with disabilities
were not satisfied only with physical integration. Layer and Kirk (2004) stated parents’ concerns about social isolation of children with disabilities in inclusive settings.

Carter (2019) suggested that inclusion should be advanced toward belonging. He defined inclusion as moving people with disabilities among those without disabilities and with them. Belonging is that an individual is invited, welcomed, known, accepted, supported, cared for, befriended, needed, and beloved by other people (Carter, 2016). This seems consistent with what the mothers commonly desired through inclusive education of their children with ID.

It has been noted that peer group acceptance is important to develop friendships and to adjust to a larger group (Ladd & Kochenderfer, 1996). Also, being accepted as a group member might be vital for students’ emotional safety in South Korea because of this country’s collectivistic and Confucian culture (e.g., H. Park et al., 2005). As noted by Triandis et al. (1988), individuals in a collectivistic culture are likely to be indifferent or hostile against those out of their group. Research has reported such discrimination against out-group and preferences for ingroup in South Korea (e.g., Kwak, Kwon, Yun, Jeong, & Huettel, 2018; J. E. Chung & Jin, 2011). When students are separated from their peer group, they are likely to feel anxious and lonely (Y. Shin, 2007; Triandis, 1995). Belonging could be also understood as being in social harmony, which is the ideal of Confucianism (Bell, 2017; Murphy & Weber, 2016; Y. B. Zhang et al., 2005).

The mothers desired that their children with ID do not take pull-out special education because it separates their children with ID from the children’s peer group. Considering the difference between being ingroup and outgroup in a collectivistic culture, it might be understandable that these mothers desired their children’s full inclusion and
emotional belonging to the peer group (a group of typically developing children in the assigned general education classroom). These mothers, however, noted that there is no choice but pull-out special education for their children with ID to make academic progress. This is consistent with their Confucian knowledge of disability, education, and morality that I discussed earlier.

Desires for teacher-led partnership. All of the mothers longed for teacher-initiated communication that provides them with information on school lives of their children with ID and professional advice on mothering. They wanted to know something more than their children’s injuries and problems such as the children’s progress, peer relationships, and good ways to support their children. This indicates that the mothers wanted teachers not only to protect their children with ID but to reach out to the mothers in order to improve their children’s development together.

The collaboration between parents and teachers, however, is a legal right of parents of children with disabilities in South Korea. The mothers could legally demand this collaboration. According to the ASED Chapter 4 Article 22 and Enforcement Rules of the ASED Article 4, IEP team members including parents should work together to make an IEP that consisted of the child’s present academic level, goals, and methods of education, and an evaluation plan in the beginning of each semester. The results of an IEP should be sent to parents at the end of each semester. Although the mothers did not provide details on their involvement in an IEP, it appears that they did not consider their involvement in an IEP as their right that justifies (a) their requests for information on their child’s school life (e.g., present academic and functional performance, progress, needs) and (b) collaboration with teachers for the child’s development.
This legal protection for parents’ participation might be distant from the Confucian culture that emphasizes the importance of teachers’ expertise and authority. As noted by Kalyanpur, Harry, and Skrtic (2000), this kind of culture leads to imbalanced power between parents and teachers, and thus, might be an obstacle to parental involvement in educational decision making. I suggest that future research examine how parents of children with ID in South Korea use their legal right to involvement in an IEP and how teachers perceive the parental involvement in educational decision making from the cultural perspective. In doing so, research might guide practical ways of embedding parents’ right to involvement in educational decision making in South Korean culture.

It is notable that the mothers desired teacher leadership when they collaborate with teachers for their children’s development. While the mothers noted their initiation of communication with teachers for protection of their children, they wanted to wait for teachers’ contact with them for the children’s development without requesting it. This seems to indicate the mothers’ desires for development of their children with ID but at the same time, seemed to show that their Confucian knowledge of disability, education, social justice, and morality would not justify requests for teachers’ support for their children’s development but rather guide them to wait for teachers’ benevolent contact with them and benevolent practices for the children’s development.

**Desired laws for harmonious school.** The mothers desired to have laws relevant to people who their children with ID meet in a general education school rather than laws for inclusive education practices. They wanted laws that mandate (a) hiring a sufficient number of licensed special education teachers, (b) rigorous disability awareness education for typically developing students, and (c) rigorous training for general
education teachers. Some of the mothers emphasized the importance of having licensed special education teachers because they have more power to advocate for their children with ID than temporary teachers. A few mothers stated desires for implementation of effective disability awareness education. They wanted students to understand the characteristics of their children’s disabilities because typically developing children in middle school are likely to tease their children with a focus on differences.

The mothers also wanted general education teachers to get trained rigorously so that they know how to teach their children with ID. This seems to be parents’ common desire regardless of cultures because American studies presented similar results. Fisher et al. (1998) reported that parents of children with severe disabilities wanted training for general education teachers, and Downing and Peckham-Hardin (2007) noted that skilled and knowledgeable teaching staff is one of the components of high quality inclusive education that parents of children with disabilities desired. Ryndak and colleagues (1996) showed that parents of children with ID experienced different quality of supports from general education teachers.

Conclusion

This research reported that seven mothers of middle school students with ID approached inclusive education laws and practices based on the Confucian and collectivistic culture in South Korea. These mothers did not believe in the practical value of using inclusive education laws. Instead, they used Confucian advocacy strategies to advocate for legal rights of their children with ID. The mothers desired laws relevant to the people surrounding their children with ID in a general education school such as high quality of teachers and disability awareness of typically developing children.
These mothers showed a Confucian conception of justice (harmony), deficit-based perspective on disability, and a meritocratic approach to education. These Confucian approaches seemed to suppress the mothers’ desires for inclusive education practices necessary for their children’s academic and functional development and belonging to peer groups without having pull-out special education. This might indicate the need of a paradigm shift for empowerment of parents of children with ID to advocate for what they desire beyond what is available for their children’s inclusive education. These results might empower parent organizations in South Korea to envision what parents of children with ID desire regarding inclusive education and encourage them to advocate for the desires with a new paradigm. Furthermore, this research might challenge the current education policy of the education department in South Korea (using pullout special education as the primary means of academic development of children with disabilities and relatively little attention on inclusive education practices) by suggesting the probability that parents of children with ID might not want separate special education, desiring for their children’s genuine belonging to the group of typically developing children with appropriate inclusive education practices for social and academic outcomes.
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Table 1

Summary of American Studies Examining Parents’ Experiences and Support Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Participants (n)</th>
<th>Research Method</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downing &amp; Peckham-Hardin (2007)</td>
<td>Examining perception of stakeholders on a quality educational program for students with moderate to severe disabilities</td>
<td>Parents of severe disabilities (9) GE teachers (17) SE teachers (6) Paraprofessional (17) [Pre, elementary, middle school]</td>
<td>Interview study</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview (15-57 min each, face-to-face)</td>
<td>Participants perceived that students with disabilities were successful in academic and social skills with inclusive education. Participants stated that a high quality inclusive education consists of (a) being with typically developing peers, (b) exposure to everything and high expectations, (c) individualized curricular and instructional supports, (d) skilled and knowledgeable teaching staff, (e) collaboration and teaming, (f) a positive and caring community, and (g) providing a balanced educational program. Participants hope that inclusive education would lead a normal life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher et al. (1998)</td>
<td>Examining perceptions of parents of students with severe disabilities regarding educational opportunities in an inclusive versus special school</td>
<td>Parents of students with severe disabilities attending GE school (17) and special school (27) [High school]</td>
<td>Interview study</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview (15-40 min each on the phone)</td>
<td>More number of parents of students attending the GE school perceived that their children were developing new skills (e.g., academic skills) than those of students attending the special school did. Both groups of parents were concerned about (a) balance between community-based instruction (instructions on functional skills) and general education classes for high school students and (b) trainings for general education teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove &amp; Fisher (1999)</td>
<td>Examining experiences of parents of children with severe disabilities regarding the inclusive education process</td>
<td>Parents of children with ID or DD (20) [Elementary, middle, high schools]</td>
<td>Interview study</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview (1hr each)</td>
<td>Most of the parents gained information on inclusive education via parent conferences, parent newsletters, and preschool teachers, and determined their children’s inclusive education for social (e.g., communication) and academic benefits. Parents perceived that schools were not ready for inclusive education, and thus, they should participate in settings and programs to facilitate inclusive education. “…face a system that tolerates inclusive education” (p.214).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Participants (n)</td>
<td>Research Method</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyer &amp; Kirk (2004)</td>
<td>Examining perception of parents of children with disabilities on inclusive education</td>
<td>Parents of children with disabilities (437) [Pre, elementary, middle, high schools]</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Parents had inclusion concept based on related laws and philosophy. Parents expected their children to make progress of social and emotional outcomes via inclusive education. Parents’ concerns included social isolation, negative attitude, the quality of instruction, teacher training and skills, and support from teachers and other parents. More parents who had young children with disabilities and/or children with intermittent or limited support needs were supportive of inclusive education than those who have secondary children and/or children with extensive support needs did.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer et al. (1998a)</td>
<td>Examining influences on parents’ perception regarding integration of children with ID in GE classrooms</td>
<td>Parents of children with ID (460) [Pre, elementary, middle, high schools]</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Parents perceived that benefits of inclusive education outweigh risk for their children with ID. Parents perceived that inclusive education would lead to mutual benefits between children with and without disabilities. Parents were concerned about peer teasing in GE classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer et al. (1998b)</td>
<td>Examining parents’ perception on inclusive practices for children with significant cognitive disabilities</td>
<td>Parents of children with ID (460) [Pre, elementary, middle, high schools]</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Researcher-created scale: ‘The Parent Attitudes Toward Inclusion’</td>
<td>Parents and siblings perceived that the child with a disability is able to function and achieve in community. Parents and siblings desired that the child with a disability be with typically developing peers as social models. Parents perceived that GE teachers were not willing to provide accommodation for the child with a disability. “Siblings’ perceptions tended to mirror those of parents” (p. 143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallapher et al. (2000)</td>
<td>Examining perspectives of parents and siblings on educational and community inclusion for children with disabilities</td>
<td>Parents (21) and siblings (8) of children with disabilities [Pre, elementary, middle, high schools]</td>
<td>Interview study</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview (17 min – 2hr each)</td>
<td>Parents and siblings perceived that the child with a disability is able to function and achieve in community. Parents and siblings desired that the child with a disability be with typically developing peers as social models. Parents perceived that GE teachers were not willing to provide accommodation for the child with a disability. “Siblings’ perceptions tended to mirror those of parents” (p. 143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Participants (n)</td>
<td>Research Method</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryndak et al. (1995)</td>
<td>Examining perception of parents of children with moderate to severe disabilities on education in inclusive GE settings</td>
<td>Parents of children with moderate to severe disabilities (13) [Pre, elementary, middle, high schools]</td>
<td>Interview study</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview (60-90 min per an interviewee)</td>
<td>Parents of children with disabilities at all ages (range = 5-20 years) positively perceived education in inclusive GE settings. Parents who previously educated children with disabilities in self-contained classrooms reported progress of academic, behavioral, and social outcomes in the current inclusive settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryndak et al. (1996)</td>
<td>Examining parents’ perception on educational services and settings for children with moderate to severe disabilities</td>
<td>Parents of children with ID or DD (13) [Pre, elementary, middle, high schools]</td>
<td>Interview study</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview</td>
<td>Parents perceived that physical integration itself was not sufficient, and they wanted their children with disabilities to be socially accepted and truly included. Parents provided different perception on educational contents for their children with disabilities based on their experiences and IEPs. Parents experienced different quality of supports from general education teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. GE = general education; SE = special education; IEP = individualized education program; ID = intellectual disability; DD = developmental disabilities.
Table 2

*Summary of South Korean Studies Examining Parents’ Experiences and Support Needs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Participants (n)</th>
<th>Research Method</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shin (2005)</td>
<td>Examining (a) reasons that parents of children with ID selected educational settings, (b) satisfaction with their selection, (c) dissatisfaction with the selection, and (d) their support needs</td>
<td>Parents of children with ID (28)</td>
<td>Interview study</td>
<td>Semi-structured Interview</td>
<td>Parents of children with ID attending a general education school: (a) reasons for the selection: improving social skills; (b) satisfaction: improvement of language use and social skills; (c) dissatisfaction: general education teachers’ indifference; (d) support needs: improving general education teachers’ attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee &amp; Ahn (2011)</td>
<td>Examining (a) experiences of secondary students with disabilities and their parents with inclusive education and (b) their support needs</td>
<td>Students with disabilities (34), Parents (21)</td>
<td>Interview study</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview</td>
<td>(a) Students with disabilities moved to special schools from inclusive education settings because of bullying, problem behaviors, lowered self-esteem, academic difficulties, concern about school adjustment, academically competitive class climate. (b) Participants perceived that the biggest benefit of inclusive education is improvement of competence, and the support needs are associated with supports for participating in class activities and other school programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee &amp; Kwak (2014)</td>
<td>Examining parents’ (a) perception on inclusive education members and (b) changes in their perspectives on inclusive education over time</td>
<td>Special education teachers (4), Parents of children with ID or DD (4)</td>
<td>Auto-ethnography study and interview study</td>
<td>Personal journals, pictures, IEPs, semi-structured interview</td>
<td>(a) Parents perceived inclusive education members as ‘unprepared school (disapproval of school entrance),’ ‘important others (general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals),’ ‘invisible wall between general and special education teachers (the lack of collaboration)’ and ‘unfair power relationship with principals.’ (b) Parents’ perspective on inclusive education changed from living together to living as a minority (e.g., peer teasing); from others to companion (relationships with special education teachers); from similarity to diversity (benefits for typically developing peers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ID = intellectual disability; DD = developmental disabilities.
**Table 3**

*Summary of American Studies Examining Inclusive Education Practices for Adolescents with Intellectual Disability*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Participant with a Disability</th>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Generalization</th>
<th>Social Validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agran, et al. (2002)</td>
<td>Multiple baseline</td>
<td>ASD (1) ID (2) Multiple</td>
<td>Middle (4)</td>
<td>English Life skill</td>
<td>SDLMI</td>
<td>Improvement in self-selected goals (i.e., appropriate touching, following directions, or responding to questions in class)</td>
<td>Maintenance of the high level of performances up to 8 days after terminating the intervention</td>
<td>Positive perception on the intervention and outcomes (participants, GE teachers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>across participants</td>
<td>disabilities (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ID (2) ID &amp; Multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disabilities (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agran, et al. (2006)</td>
<td>Multiple baseline</td>
<td>ASD (1) ID (1) ID &amp; ADHD</td>
<td>Middle (3)</td>
<td>Science Geography</td>
<td>SDLMI</td>
<td>Improvement in self-selected goals (i.e., participation in lab activities, identification of different types of maps, identifying body organs)</td>
<td>Maintenance of the high level of performances up to 3.5 months after terminating the intervention</td>
<td>Positive perception on the intervention and/or outcomes (participants, GE and SE teachers, a paraprofessional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>across participants</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ID (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agran, et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Multiple baseline</td>
<td>ID (2) ID &amp; ADHD (1)</td>
<td>Junior high</td>
<td>Basic family consumer</td>
<td>SDLMI</td>
<td>Improvement in self-selected goals (i.e., public speaking, asking questions, or preparing foods in class)</td>
<td>Maintenance of the high level of performances up to 5 weeks after terminating the intervention</td>
<td>Positive perception on the intervention and/or outcomes (participants, teachers, a SLP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>across participants</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>science Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggs, et al. (2017)</td>
<td>Multiple probe</td>
<td>ID (3) ID &amp; visual</td>
<td>Middle (4)</td>
<td>Spanish Language arts</td>
<td>Collaborative planning &amp;</td>
<td>Improvement in social interaction with peers Minimal increases in using AAC</td>
<td>Generalization of the increased social interaction in another class</td>
<td>Positive perception on the intervention and/or outcomes (participants, GE and SE teachers, SLPs, paraprofessionals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>across participants</td>
<td>perception impairment (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social arts</td>
<td>Peer support arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>School Level</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td>Social Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock, et al. (2016)</td>
<td>Multiple probe across participants</td>
<td>ASD (2) ID (1) ID &amp; ASD (1)</td>
<td>Middle (4)</td>
<td>Art Computer</td>
<td>Peer support arrangements</td>
<td>Increases in interactions with peers 3 participants’ Improvement in goal behavior (i.e., task completion or typing)</td>
<td>little evidence of generalization of the outcome behaviors in another class</td>
<td>Positive perception on the intervention (Peer partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock &amp; Carter (2016)</td>
<td>Multiple probe across participants</td>
<td>ASD (1) ID (1) ID &amp; ADHD (1) ID &amp; speech and hearing impairment (1)</td>
<td>Middle (4)</td>
<td>Science Math</td>
<td>Peer support arrangements</td>
<td>Increases in social interactions between 3 participants and peers Maintenance of peer partners’ academic engagement levels</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Positive perception on efficacy of researcher-provided training package and the participants’ outcomes A little or no difficulty in finding time to deliver the training for paraprofessionals (SE teachers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, et al. (2011)</td>
<td>Multiple baseline across participants</td>
<td>ID (1) ID &amp; TBI (1) ID &amp; hearing and visual impairment (1)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>Culinary art Ceramics</td>
<td>Peer support arrangements</td>
<td>Increases in social interactions with peers Maintenance of peer partners’ academic engagement levels</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Positive perception on the intervention including satisfaction and acceptability and feasibility (peer partners, participants, a GE teacher, paraprofessionals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Disability (n)</td>
<td>School Level (n)</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td>Social Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Carter et al. (2015)   | Comparative group design                    | ASD (32)                                    | High (99)        | Core academic or elective classes | Peer support arrangements             | More increases in participants’ social interactions with peers and their contributions to the interactions in a peer support group  
More improvement in social contact with peers and academic engagement in a peer support group  
No significant difference in academic achievement between the groups | Not stated                                                                 | Positive perception on the intervention (e.g., satisfaction, feasibility, outcomes (e.g., gaining more friends)  
(peer partners, participants, SE and GE teachers, paraprofessionals) |
|                        |                                             | ID (50)                                     |                  |                             |                                       |                                                                                             |                                                                                |                                                                                                          |
|                        |                                             | ID & ASD (10)                               |                  |                             |                                       |                                                                                             |                                                                                |                                                                                                          |
|                        |                                             | Multiple disabilities (2)                   |                  |                             |                                       |                                                                                             |                                                                                |                                                                                                          |
|                        |                                             | Other developmental disabilities (5)        |                  |                             |                                       |                                                                                             |                                                                                |                                                                                                          |
| Carter, et al. (2005)  | Withdrawal design (ABAB, BABA)              | ID (1)                                      | Middle (1)       | English                     | Peer support arrangements altering the number of peer partners | More increases in participants’ social interactions and contact with the general curriculum with two peer partners than with one peer partner | Not stated                                                                 | Not stated                                                                                               |
|                        |                                             | ID & ASD (2)                                | High (1)         | Science                     |                                       |                                                                                             |                                                                                |                                                                                                          |
| Carter, et al. (2007)  | Delayed multiple baseline across participants| ID (1)                                      | High (4)         | Art                         | Peer support arrangements             | Much more increases in participants’ interactions with peers during peer support arrangements than adult supports  
Reciprocal peer interactions about balanced topics (i.e., academic, social topics)  
Participants’ variable academic engagement | Not stated                                                                 | Not stated                                                                                               |
<p>|                        |                                             | ID &amp; visual and hearing impairment (1)      |                  |                             |                                       |                                                                                             |                                                                                |                                                                                                          |
|                        |                                             | ID &amp; speech/language impairment (1)         |                  |                             |                                       |                                                                                             |                                                                                |                                                                                                          |
|                        |                                             | ID &amp; physical disabilities (1)              |                  |                             |                                       |                                                                                             |                                                                                |                                                                                                          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Disability (n)</th>
<th>School Level (n)</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Generalization</th>
<th>Social Validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chung &amp; Carter (2013)</td>
<td>Multiple baseline across participants and classrooms</td>
<td>ID (2)</td>
<td>Middle (2)</td>
<td>Art Science Bilingual social studies</td>
<td>Peer support arrangements focusing on participants’ use of an SGD</td>
<td>Increases in peer interactions, use of a SGD, and proximity to a SGD</td>
<td>Parent reports: Increases in using SGD at home</td>
<td>Positive perception on the intervention goals, acceptability, and feasibility (parents, paraprofessionals, GE teachers) Participants’ and peer partners’ satisfaction with the intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, et al. (2007)</td>
<td>Adapted alternating treatment design</td>
<td>ID (4)</td>
<td>Elementary (1)</td>
<td>Science Math History</td>
<td>Embedded instruction using simultaneous prompts vs. Massed instruction with the same prompts</td>
<td>Mastery of core and functional content sight words both in both conditions</td>
<td>Middle and high school participants maintained identifying the target words that they learned in both conditions</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, et al. (1999)</td>
<td>Parallel treatment design</td>
<td>ID (2)</td>
<td>High (2)</td>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td>Embedded instruction without time delay and error correction procedures</td>
<td>Mastery of factual information related or unrelated to class contents</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copeland, Hughes, Agran, et al. (2002)</td>
<td>Multiple baseline across participants</td>
<td>ID (2)</td>
<td>High (4)</td>
<td>Cosmetology Hairdressing</td>
<td>Task adaptation Direct instruction Student-directed learning strategies</td>
<td>Improvement in task completion Mastery of self-monitoring and self-evaluation steps</td>
<td>Maintenance of the improvement in task completion without adult assistance, praise, or feedback</td>
<td>Positive perception on the intervention and the outcomes (Participations, a cosmetology teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Disability (n)</td>
<td>School Level (n)</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td>Social Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cushing &amp; Kennedy (1997)</td>
<td>Withdrawal (2) Multiple baseline across classes (1)</td>
<td>ID (2) Multiple disabilities (1)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>English Health Social studies Science</td>
<td>Peer support arrangements</td>
<td>Increases in peer partners’ academic engagement</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Positive perception on the peer partners’ outcomes (SE personnel, naïve observers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cushing, Kennedy, Shukla, Davis, &amp; Meyer (1997)</td>
<td>Withdrawal (ABABAB)</td>
<td>ID (1) Multiple disabilities (1)</td>
<td>Middle (2)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Cooperative learning vs. peer support arrangements</td>
<td>Similar increases in the participants’ active engagement in class in social grouping and peer support conditions Participants’ more social engagement and peer partners’ higher academic achievement in the peer support condition</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Preference of cooperative learning to peer support arrangements (Peers, teachers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilberts et al. (2001)</td>
<td>Multiple baseline across participants</td>
<td>ID (5)</td>
<td>Middle (5)</td>
<td>Art History Reading Spanish</td>
<td>Peer-delivered self-monitoring</td>
<td>Improvement in the participants’ classroom behavior The participants’ mastery of self-monitoring strategies</td>
<td>Maintenance of the improved classroom behavior after withholding adult prompts, praise, and feedback</td>
<td>Positive (3 GE teachers), or negative (1 GE teacher) perception on the intervention procedures and effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haring &amp; Breen (1992)</td>
<td>Multiple baseline across participants</td>
<td>ASD (1) ID &amp; language delay (1)</td>
<td>Junior high (2) Transition (5 min) Lunch time</td>
<td>Peer social network intervention</td>
<td>Increases in peer interactions Increases in appropriate social responding in non-structured contexts</td>
<td>Maintenance of the high frequency of the interactions after limiting the network members’ roles</td>
<td>Positive perception on the intervention procedures and effects (peers, participants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Disability $(n)$</td>
<td>School Level $(n)$</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td>Social Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrich et al. (2016)</td>
<td>Multiple probe across participants</td>
<td>ID (1) ID &amp; ASD (1)</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Embedded instruction using simultaneous prompts</td>
<td>Mastery of the target skills (i.e., discrete skills and chained skills)</td>
<td>Generalization of the acquired skills across persons, settings, and materials</td>
<td>Positive perception on the participants' capacity to learn in GE classes (peers, GE teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, Agran, Copeland, et al. (2002)</td>
<td>Multiple baseline across participants</td>
<td>ID (2) ID &amp; ASD (1)</td>
<td>High (4)</td>
<td>Occupational health</td>
<td>Individualized self-monitoring</td>
<td>Increases in social and academic behaviors</td>
<td>Maintenance of the outcomes after withholding self-monitoring training</td>
<td>Positive perception on the intervention effects (Peers, GE teachers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Multiple baseline across participants</td>
<td>ASD (1) ID &amp; ASD (3)</td>
<td>High (6)</td>
<td>Anatomy personal finance</td>
<td>Communicating on book use with opportunities of interaction</td>
<td>Increases in peer interactions</td>
<td>Maintenance of the outcomes up to 8 months after introducing a communication book to the participants</td>
<td>Positive perception on the intervention procedures and/or effects (peers, participants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, Copeland, Wehmeyer, et al. (2002)</td>
<td>Multiple baseline across participants</td>
<td>ID (1) ID &amp; ASD (1)</td>
<td>High (5)</td>
<td>Lunch time Physical education</td>
<td>Adult-delivered verbal directive for a peer buddy to do a leisure activity with a participant</td>
<td>Increases in frequency and quality of peer interactions</td>
<td>Variability of the participants' communication modes and conversation topics</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Disability (n)</td>
<td>School Level (n)</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td>Social Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes et al. (2004)</td>
<td>Multiple baseline across</td>
<td>ID (2)</td>
<td>High (5)</td>
<td>Physical education</td>
<td>Direct instruction</td>
<td>Increases in initiation of and engagement in recreational activities</td>
<td>Maintenance of the outcomes after terminating adult-delivered trainings</td>
<td>Positive perception on the intervention acceptability and satisfaction (Peer partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participants</td>
<td>ID &amp; speech impairment (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student-directed learning skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement of using self-promoting, self-evaluation strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes et al. (2011)</td>
<td>Multiple baseline across</td>
<td>ID (1)</td>
<td>High (5)</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Communicating book use with opportunities of interaction</td>
<td>Increases in the participants’ interactions with peer partners</td>
<td>Maintenance of high levels of the peer interactions up to 6 months after terminating the intervention</td>
<td>Participants’ satisfaction with the intervention outcomes (e.g., making more friends)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participants and settings</td>
<td>ID &amp; speech impairment (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical education</td>
<td></td>
<td>High quality of the peer interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ID &amp; ASD (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cosmetology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varied reciprocity of the peer interactions across the participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ID, ASD, hearing impairment (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jameson et al. (2007)</td>
<td>Alternating treatment</td>
<td>ID (4)</td>
<td>Middle (4)</td>
<td>Foods</td>
<td>Embedded instruction vs. massed instruction in a self-contained classroom</td>
<td>All participants’ mastery of target skills in both conditions</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Positive perception on acceptability and the effects of the prompt strategies; Superior effects of the embedded instruction to facilitate inclusion (SE teacher, paraprofessional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teens living Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed results of efficiency of the interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>School Level (n)</td>
<td>Disability (n)</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td>Social Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jameson et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Alternating treatment</td>
<td>K-G1 (2) Middle (2)</td>
<td>ASD (3) ID (1)</td>
<td>Language arts Computer</td>
<td>Embedded instruction vs. massed one-to-one instruction</td>
<td>Attrition of a kindergarten child All three participants mastery of target academic skills in both conditions No significant difference of efficacy of the two interventions</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Positive perception on acceptability, feasibility, and the effects of the two intervention strategies; Superior effects of the embedded instruction to facilitate inclusion (SE and GE teachers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimenez et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Multiple probe across two science concepts</td>
<td>Middle (3)</td>
<td>ID (3)</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Self-prompts using adapted task books Use of KWHL workbook</td>
<td>All participants mastery of two science concepts in a SE classroom</td>
<td>Generalization of the self-prompting skills in a GE science classroom</td>
<td>Strong acceptability of the intervention goals, procedures, an outcomes (SE and GE teachers) Participants’ satisfaction with the intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimenez et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Multiple probe across three science units</td>
<td>Middle (3)</td>
<td>ID (5)</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Peer-mediated embedded instruction with a SE teacher’s supplementary instruction if needed</td>
<td>Increases in all participants’ correct response across all the units Additional support needed for 3 participants</td>
<td>Maintenance of the acquired units three sessions after each participant mastered</td>
<td>Positive perception on feasibility, acceptability, and the effects of the intervention (GE and SE teachers) Peer providers’ satisfaction with the intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy et al. (1997)</td>
<td>Multiple baseline across classes</td>
<td>High (1) Middle (1)</td>
<td>ID (1) ID &amp; CP (1)</td>
<td>Science Hawaiian studies Physical education Arts/crafts</td>
<td>Peer support arrangements; collaboration of SE and GE teachers; and adaptation</td>
<td>Improvement in the participants’ contact with typically developing peers</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>The participants’ positive perception on the intervention effects (i.e., gaining more friends)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>School Level (n)</td>
<td>Disability (n)</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td>Social Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy &amp; Itkonen</td>
<td>Multiple baseline across participants</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>ID (2)</td>
<td>Art, English, Family health, Life science</td>
<td>Peer groups, collaboration of SE and GE teachers; and adaptation</td>
<td>Improvement in the participants’ contact with typically developing peers</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>The participants’ positive perception on the intervention outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonnell et al.</td>
<td>Multiple probe across behaviors</td>
<td>Middle (4)</td>
<td>ID (4)</td>
<td>Food and nutrition, Health, Computer</td>
<td>Embedded instruction</td>
<td>All participants’ mastery of the target academic skills</td>
<td>Maintenance of the target skills after terminating the intervention</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonnell et al.</td>
<td>Multiple probe across participants</td>
<td>Middle (3)</td>
<td>ID or multiple disabilities (3)</td>
<td>Math, Physical education, History</td>
<td>Cooperative learning</td>
<td>Increases in class engagement, Decrease in off-task behavior</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riesen et al.</td>
<td>Adapted alternating treatment</td>
<td>Middle (4)</td>
<td>ASD (1) ID (1) Multiple disabilities (2)</td>
<td>Science, German, History</td>
<td>Embedded instruction using constant vs. simultaneous time delay</td>
<td>All participants’ mastery of the target skills in both conditions, Mixed results of the relative efficacy of the two time delay strategies</td>
<td>Generalization of the target skills in different materials</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaefer &amp; Armentrout</td>
<td>Withdrawal (ABAB)</td>
<td>Middle (1)</td>
<td>ID (1)</td>
<td>Life management</td>
<td>Pairing with a peer buddy</td>
<td>Increases in the participant’s social initiation skills following the intervention</td>
<td>Generalization of the social initiation skills in physical education class</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shukla et al. (1998)</td>
<td>Multiple treatment withdrawal (ABACABA/C/ACABAC AB)</td>
<td>Middle (3)</td>
<td>ID (2) ID &amp; CP (1)</td>
<td>Art, Industrial crafts, Math, Social studies</td>
<td>Peer support arrangements</td>
<td>Increases in active engagement of the participants and their peer partners, Increases in peer interactions during peer support without adult involvement</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>School Level (n)</td>
<td>Disability (n)</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td>Social Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Multiple probe across participants</td>
<td>Middle (3)</td>
<td>ASD (1)</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Computer-assisted embedded instruction; peer assistance if needed</td>
<td>Increases in correct responses related to target science terms</td>
<td>Generalization of applying the target science terms to another material (e.g., worksheets)</td>
<td>Positive perception on the social significance of the intervention goal, procedures, feasibility, and the effects (Participants, peers, SE and GE teachers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wehmeyer et al. (2003)</td>
<td>Multiple baseline across participants</td>
<td>Middle (3)</td>
<td>ID &amp; speech impairment (1) ID, CP, &amp; speech impairment (1) ID, ASD, &amp; speech/ language impairment (1)</td>
<td>Art History Science</td>
<td>Self-monitoring or antecedent cue regulation plus self-evaluation and self-reinforcement</td>
<td>Improvement in all participants' target behaviors</td>
<td>Maintenance of the improvement after withdrawing adult prompts and feedbacks</td>
<td>SE teachers’ positive perception on the intervention effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood et al. (2015)</td>
<td>Multiple probe across participants</td>
<td>Middle (3)</td>
<td>ID (3)</td>
<td>Social studies</td>
<td>Least prompts; task adaptation; graphic organizer or small question journals</td>
<td>Increases in generating and answering questions</td>
<td>Maintenance of the outcomes after withdrawing adult prompts and supports except for a participant’s on-task and listening skills</td>
<td>Positive perceptions on the goals and the effects of the intervention (SE and GE teachers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Middle = middle school; High = high school; ID = intellectual disability; ASD = autism spectrum disorder; CP = cerebral palsy; ADHD = attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder; G = grade; K = kindergarten; SDLMI = self-determined learning model of instruction.
### Table 4

**Characteristics of Inclusive Education Practices for Secondary Students with Intellectual Disability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusive Education Practices</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Inclusive Context</th>
<th>Intervention Agent(s)</th>
<th>Commonly Required Skills</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Peer Support Arrangements     | Middle School: 16, High School: 10 | M: Art, science, social studies, English, language arts, Spanish, piano, computer, physical education  
H: Science, English, art, arts/crafts, ceramics, health science | Direct  
supporter: Peers  
Facilitator: SE teacher or Paraprofessional  
Inclusive Context | Verbal instruction, modeling, reinforcement, feedback, coaching in class, and providing a support menu/checklist for supports | Peer partners: Prompts, fading prompts  
Facilitator: | Increase in peer interactions  
Mix results regarding class engagement  
Increase in typing skills |
| Embedded Instruction          | Middle School: 18, High School: 6 | M: Science, language arts, math, history, food and nutrition, computer  
H: English, math, history, biology, computer | SE teacher, paraprofessional, peer, or computer  
Who | Modeling, providing scripts, role-play, reinforcement, feedback | Time delay, modeling, verbal prompting, reinforcement, error correction | Mastery of key vocabulary  
Mastery of chained academic skills (e.g., web searching) |
| Inquiry Lesson                | Middle School: 2, High School: 0 | M: Science | Researcher or SE teacher  
Who | Providing scripts, competency-based training | Modifying class materials, time delay, modeling, prompts, reinforcement  
Supports for three steps of the SDLMI | Increase in self-directed learning skills |
| SDLMI                         | Middle School: 7, High School: 0 | M: English, physical science, basic family consumer science, life skill, geography, speech  
H: Art, history, reading, Spanish, Mechanics, cosmetology, hairdressing, culinary arts, occupational health, physical education | Researcher, SE teacher, or GE teacher  
Who | Providing scripts | Supports for three steps of the SDLMI  
Increase in self-directed learning skills  
Increase in social skills |
| Self-Management Strategies    | Middle School: 7, High School: 21 | M: Art, history, reading, Spanish  
H: Mechanics, cosmetology, hairdressing, culinary arts, occupational health, physical education | Researcher or peer  
Who | Providing scripts, competency-based training | Modeling, prompts, feedback, error correction, reinforcement | Increase in peer interactions  
Increase in class engagement  
Increase in academic achievement |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusive Education Practices</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Inclusive Context</th>
<th>Intervention Agent(s)</th>
<th>Commonly Required Skills</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Modifying class materials, training students in performing four different roles, supervision of students' performances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M: English</td>
<td>GE teacher</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-Mediated Social Support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M, H: Lunch Recess time Physical education</td>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>Verbal instructions, a SE teachers' support for a student with ID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. GE = general education; SE = special education; H = high school; M = middle school; ID = intellectual disability.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Participant with a Disability</th>
<th>Inclusive Context</th>
<th>Intervention Agent(s)</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>(^1)Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kong et al. (2009)</td>
<td>ABAB</td>
<td>ID (3)</td>
<td>High school (3)</td>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>Curricular and instructional adaptation, peer tutoring, 1:1 instruction, and Reinforcement</td>
<td>Increases in class engagement, Improvement of task completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kook &amp; Paik (2013)</td>
<td>Multiple probe baseline design across settings</td>
<td>ID (1)</td>
<td>Middle school (1)</td>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>FBA-based intervention consisting of curricular and instructional adaptation, self-monitoring of class engagement and DRA</td>
<td>Decreases in problem behaviors including out-of-seat behavior, tearing out a book, banging a table, and yelling Increases in class engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lim (2017)</td>
<td>Multiple baseline across participants</td>
<td>ID (3)</td>
<td>Middle school (3)</td>
<td>Researcher team</td>
<td>Curricular and instructional adaptation, reinforcement, self-evaluation of class engagement, and token economy</td>
<td>Increases in class engagement, Decreases in off-task behaviors Improvement of academic achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shim &amp; Shin (2007)</td>
<td>ABAB</td>
<td>ID (3)</td>
<td>Middle school (3)</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>FBA-based intervention consisting of goal setting, self-monitoring, self-evaluation, self-reinforcement, and token economy</td>
<td>Decreases in problem behaviors including yelling, aggression, and disruption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Note.} ID = intellectual disability.

\(^1\)Outcomes reported by researchers.
**Table 6**

*Participants’ Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child with a Disability</th>
<th>Participant Parent</th>
<th>The Child’s Sibling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Grade, Gender, Disability</td>
<td>Parent, Birth Year, Living City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>2 (G8), F, ID</td>
<td>Mother, 1981, Boryeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Caesar</td>
<td>2 (G8), 3 (G9), F, ID</td>
<td>Mother, 1976, Boryeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dori</td>
<td>2 (G8), F, ID, ASD</td>
<td>Mother, 1974, Boryeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>2 (G8), M, ID, ASD</td>
<td>Mother, 1977, Incheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felicia</td>
<td>1 (G7), F, ID</td>
<td>Mother, Not stated, Boryeong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gus</td>
<td>3 (G9), M, ID</td>
<td>Mother, 1977, Incheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2 (G8), M, ID</td>
<td>Mother, 1977, Incheon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. ASD = Autism spectrum disorder; ID = intellectual disability; F = female; M = male; G = grade.*
Table 7

*Themes and Categories by Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother-teacher communication</td>
<td>Protection request with different intensity</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcategory 1: Mild intensity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcategory 2: Strong intensity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desires for teacher-initiated communication</td>
<td>Subcategory 1: Provision of information on the child’s school life</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcategory 2: Teachers’ guidance of the mother’s support for the child with ID</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular knowledge that suppressed further desires for inclusive education</td>
<td>Desires for the child’s belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place-and-hope for social outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deficit-based moral approach to academic supports</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The mother-held concerns about the child’s adult life</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture-based advocacy for inclusive education</td>
<td>Low practical value of legal tools</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common use of cultural tools</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desired laws for better school contexts</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. A = Amy’s mother; BC = the mother of Betty and Caesar; D = Dori’s mother; E = Evan’s mother; F = Felicia’s mother; G = Gus’s mother; H = Harry’s mother; ID = intellectual disability.*
Appendix A

Interview Scripts

I used semi-structured and open-ended interview questions that I developed based on my research questions. Questions followed by a bullet point were the interview questions. I asked these questions written in Korean during interviews.

Research Question 1: What do parents know about legal protections for inclusive education of students with ID?

- 어떤 법이 지적장애 자녀가 통합학급에서 학습할 수 있도록 보장한다고 생각하십니까? [What laws do you think ensure that your child learn in an inclusive classroom?]

Research Question 2: What laws do parents want to have for inclusive education of students with ID?

- 통합학급 교실에서 지적장애 자녀의 교육을 지원하기 위해서 법이 어떻게 변하였으면 좋겠습니까? [What changes to laws would you like to have to support your child’s education in an inclusive classroom]?
- 통합학급 교실에서 지적장애 자녀의 교육을 지원하기 위해서 어떤 법이 새로 생겼으면 좋겠습니까? [What new laws would you like to have to support your child’s education in an inclusive classroom]?

Research Question 3: What do parents know about inclusive education practices for middle school students with ID?

- 지적장애 자녀가 일반학급 학생들에게 제공되는 모든 활동에 참여하도록 학교는 무엇을 지원하고 있습니까? [What does your child’s school do to help him/her participate in all the activities provided to the class students]?
Follow-up question: 사회 시간에 당신의 자녀가 의미있게 참여하도록 학교는 어떤 지원을 제공합니까? [What supports does your school provide for your child to be meaningfully included in social studies classes? (I will ask about the school’s supports in different subject classes including science, math, Korean, art, and music classes)]

Follow-up question: 자녀가 또래와 함께 방과 후 활동에 참여하도록 학교는 어떤 도움을 주고 있습니까? [What does your school do to help your child participate in after school activities]?

Research Question 4: What inclusive education practices do parents want to be implemented for students with ID?

- 자녀의 성공적인 통합교육을 위해 무엇이 필요할 것 같습니까? [What would your child need to be successful in an inclusive classroom]?
- 통합학급 교실에서 자녀가 학습할 수 있도록 어떤 교육적 방법이 실행되었으며 좋겠습니까? [What educational practices would you like to have implemented to support your child in an inclusive classroom]?
Appendix B

An Example of a Translation Discussion List

The following table presents a part of the data that I discussed with my doctoral advisor and a certified translator to translate Korean data into English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Korean Data</th>
<th>Translation into English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>특수애라고 하면 색안경을 끼고 보게 되는 거죠</td>
<td>…people see special kids through biased colored glasses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>낯가래가지고...</td>
<td>…because he was shy of new people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…어려우면 제끼고</td>
<td>…take out something too difficult for her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…애들이 빠릿빠릿해가지고 변수도 많고 그래서 빨리 음직여야하는데 Dori 는 힘들 것 같네요</td>
<td>… should be able to follow unpredictable practice schedules but Dori is not able to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dori 가 유두리가 없어요</td>
<td>Dori is not flexible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...항상 노심초사</td>
<td>I was always nervous about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>네살 보단 다섯살, 다섯살 보단 여섯살, 말귀알아듣는 것도 훨씬 나아지고 하는게 보이니까 제가 거기서 확신을 했죠.</td>
<td>I became convinced [of benefits of inclusive education] because I saw that his mealtime skills and rule-following increasingly improved as he advanced to the next academic year, and he became much better at understanding language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>작업에 그렇게 미련이 없거든요</td>
<td>I do not hold on to thinking about Evan’s job in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>이렇게 열일통망하지 않고</td>
<td>Like not doing it absentmindedly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>분위기를 읽는 기회</td>
<td>The opportunity to read the ambiance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>공든탑이 순간 무너지거든요</td>
<td>Then, all of the mom’s efforts for the 18 years become meaningless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>근데 그걸 거기서 저는 좀 메달리고 싶은데. 학교에서.</td>
<td>I want to beg the school staff for keeping her at this school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2학년때 만큼만은 이렇게 하지 말아야지. 정신 똑 바로 차려야지</td>
<td>I asserted myself that I must not repeat my mistakes during the new school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>용가리 통뼈죠</td>
<td>It would be like a dragon’s strong born [Korean idiom similar to “a drop in the ocean”].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>그 교육은 그냥 잘 받아. 아님 그냥 겪할기 식으로 하는 거야.</td>
<td>I wonder if they truly learn about our kids or just superficially take the education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

An Example of a Transcript in Korean and English

I used transcripts that were written in both Korean and English for data analysis. The following transcript shows an example of the Korean and English transcripts that I used for coding data.

[Q] 어머님 서울 어 느 인문계 고등학교에서 지적장애 학생이 일반학급 수업시간에 문제행동을 해서요 그 비장애 학생 부모님들이 불만을 학교에 얘기했어요 왜 우리 애는 지금 대학을 갈려고 열심히 해야하는데 지적장애 아이의 문제행동 때문에 공부에 방해가 된다. 재물 중 어abilité 해답이라고 이렇게 다른 부모님들이 연합으로 교장한테 얘기한 거에요. 그래서 그 아이가 결국 퇴학을 당했어요.

[Q] I read a news article about the expulsion of a student with intellectual disability. Parents of other students complained about the student’s disruptive behavior to the school principal. They told the principal that their children should study hard for the college entrance exam, but because of the disruptive behavior, their kids were experiencing disadvantages. As a result, the student with a disability was expelled from the school.

와우 그 비슷한 얘기가 많이 듣곤 있어요. Wow, I’ve heard about similar cases many times.

[Q] 아 그래요. 근데 혹시 그럴 일이 없겠지만 만약에 어머니에게 Harry가 고등학교 갔는데 선생님이 다른 애들을 잡시 중단에 바빴지만 Harry 때문에 면학 분위기를 해치니까 다른 학부모들이 항의를 한다. 학교를 옮기든 자퇴를 하든지 해라 이렇게 하시면 어머님은 어떻게 이 상황을 대처하시겠어요?

[Q] Oh, really? But if, it should not happen to Harry, but this is a just subjunctive mood. If this happened to Harry, what would you address it? Let’s say parents of other students ask Harry’s expulsion because he disrupted their kids’ study. How would you handle this?

만약에 독갈은 일이 생긴다면 문제행동을 정확하게 사유를 따져야겠죠. 학시마다 그래는 건지 아니 어쩌다 한 번 갖고 그런건지는 정확하게 따져가지고 만약에 빈번한 일이 아니고 어쩌다 한번한것 같은는 잦대 저는 전학이나 뭐 이런 건 절대 안하죠. 빈번하게 한다. 그래면 거기에 대해서는 전학같 생각은 없으니까 각서를 쓸지라도 다시 한번만 일이 있을 때에는 이런 식으로 하지 무조건 저는 그거를 받아들이는 않아도 것 같아요.

I will check frequency of Harry’s disruptive behavior; if he showed the behavior occasionally versus every class. I would not follow the principal’s decision if the behavior occurred just once. But if he did engage in the behavior often, I will write memorandum like if this happens again..., because I don’t want Harry to be moved from the school. I will not just accept the school’s decision.

[Q] 만약에 특수학교로 강제전학을 한다면요? 요즘 학폭위 같은것도 하잖아요? 그런거 비슷하게 위원회를 열어서 강제전학으로 특수학교로 가라 이렇게 학교에서 정했다면 어머님은 어떻게 하시겠어요?

[Q] What if the school forces Harry to move to a special school for children with intellectual disability? What would you do?

저는 최대한으로 싸워볼 때까지 싸워보고 안되면 가겠지만 우리 현실이 우리를 위해서 싸워줄 사람이 누가 있겠어요. 결국은 그렇게되면 다 갈 수 밖에 없는 거잖아요. 결국은.
I will do my best to fight against the school, and if I lose at the end, I cannot help but follow the school’s decision. Who can fight for us? I think, when all comes to all, we just cannot but leave the school, at the end.

[Q] 어머니 혹시 특수교육법이나 어떤 우리나라의 어떠한 법이 장애 아이들이 일반학교에서 공부할 수 있도록 보장하는 법이 있는 거를 알고 계세요?
[Q] Did you know that there are laws ensuring that students with disabilities can study in general education schools?

예는 듣긴 들었어요 법이 있다는 걸.
Yes, I heard that there is that kind of law.

[Q] 어떤 법이요?
통합교육이 의무적인 걸 부모교육을 그런 걸 참석해서 한 번들은 것 같아요.
[Q] Can you tell me about the laws?
I heard that inclusive education is mandatory for parent training one time.

[Q] 알고 계신 내용을 좀 설명해 주시겠어요?
정확하게 제가 자세하게는机关 못하지만 특수아동이라고 해서 무조건 특수학교에만 배정되는데 아니라 통합학교에 갈 수 있는 권리가 있다는 거. 법으로 지정되다는 거.
[Q] Can you tell me what you heard there?
I can’t tell you exactly what it is, but I know that students with special needs have the right to attend inclusive school. It’s not that they must go to special schools. Laws ensure this.

[Q] 아 내 그거를 어디서 하는 부모교육을 듣었었어요?
어딘지는 제도 하도 여기저기 다녀서. 아마 복지관 교육일것 같아요 복지관 부모교육일것 같아요.
[Q] Got it. Which place did you get the parent training?
I can’t exactly remember where it was. I think it was maybe the parent training at the local rehabilitation center for people with disabilities.

[Q] 아 내. 어머님 학교에서 장애를 이유로 입학을 거부하면 그렇게 불법이에요
그런데 법은 법이지만 막상 현실에 일어나면 그 법대로 되진 않잖아요. 현실 속에서는. 저희들한테는 참 많이 불리하게 다 적용되는 걸로 알고 있는데.
[Q] I see. It’s illegal that a school rejects entrance of a child with a disability.
But a law is a law. When things happen in the real world, they are not always dealt with the law. As far as I know, many things are unfavorable to us.

[Q] 어떤 점에서요?
아가 말씀하신 것처럼 특수아동이라고 해서 수업시간에 조금만 피해줘도 그렇게 믿으면 넣고 전학가라고 그라고 믿이라 그리고 그런 걸 저는 많이 듣곤요 주변에서도.
[Q] Can you tell me more about that?
Like the case you told me, people file complaints against kids with special needs or want the kids to transfer to another school if the kids cause them even very few disadvantages. It’s only because the kids are special kids.